

New Series

Volume XI, Number 43

August 1960

The Review of English Studies

THE UNIVERSITY
OF MICHIGAN

OCT 11 1960

A Quarterly Journal of
English Literature and the English Language

PERIODICAL
READING ROOM

Editors: PETER ALEXANDER, NORMAN DAVIS

CONTENTS

The Development of a Theme in <i>Piers Plowman</i> . By A. C. Spearing	241
Spenser's Pension. By Herbert Berry and E. K. Timings	254
<i>Areopagitica</i> and a Forgotten Licensing Controversy. By Ernest Sirluck	260
Gray's 'The Triumphs of Owen'. By Arthur Johnston	275
Meredith's <i>Periander</i> . By J. M. S. Tompkins	286

NOTES

The Prophetic Label in <i>Cymbeline</i> (H. L. Rogers)	296
Dryden's Messianic Eclogue (Earl Miner)	299
<i>The Rime of The Ancient Mariner</i> : A Discourse on Prayer? (Malcolm Ware)	303

CORRESPONDENCE

Verse and its Feet (John Buxton)	305
--	-----

(Continued at foot of next page)

OXFORD · AT THE CLARENDON PRESS

Single number: 14/- net: Subscription for four consecutive numbers: 45/-

The Review of English Studies

Advisory Panel: H. S. BENNETT; JOHN BUTT; H. B. CHARLTON; SIR IFOR EVANS; SIR HERBERT GRIERSON; EDITH J. MORLEY; ALLARDYCE NICOLL; PERCY SIMPSON; KENNETH SISAM; D. NICHOL SMITH; JAMES R. SUTHERLAND; ALICE WALKER; DOROTHY WHITELOCK; F. P. WILSON; J. DOVER WILSON; C. L. WRENN.

MSS. offered for publication, correspondence on the subject-matter of the Journal, and books for review should be addressed to The Editors, *The Review of English Studies*, c/o The Clarendon Press, Oxford. MSS. cannot be returned unless postage is enclosed. Authors of articles printed will be entitled to 25 free offprints and may buy additional copies if application is made to the Editor when returning corrected proofs.

All other correspondence should be addressed to the Publishers, Oxford University Press, Amen House, Warwick Square, London, E.C. 4.

CONTENTS (*continued*)

REVIEWS, ETC.

Beowulf. An Introduction to the Study of the Poem with a Discussion of the Stories of Offa and Finn, by R. W. Chambers, with a Supplement by C. L. Wrenn, 306; The Paris Psalter. MS. Bibliothèque Nationale Fonds Latin 8824. Preface by various contributors collected by Bertram Colgrave, 307; Studies in Heroic Legend and in Current Speech, by Kemp Malone, edited by Stefán Einarsson and Norman E. Eliason, 309; The South English Legendary, edited by Charlotte D'Evelyn and Anna J. Mill, 311; Geoffrey Chaucer. Canterbury Tales, edited by A. C. Cawley, 312; Design in Chaucer's *Troilus*, by Sanford B. Meech, 314; The Medieval Theatre in the Round, by Richard Southern, 316; Humanism and Poetry in the Early Tudor Period, by H. A. Mason, 317; The Works of Thomas Nashe, edited by Ronald B. McKerrow, reprinted with notes, edited by F. P. Wilson, 319; Act Division in Elizabethan and Jacobean Plays 1583-1616, by Wilfred T. Jewkes, 322; The Sonnets of William Alabaster, edited by G. M. Story and Helen Gardner, 323; The Poems of James VI of Scotland, edited by James Craigie, Vol. II, 325; Thomas Middleton, by Richard Hindry Barker, 326; The Phonetic Writings of Robert Robinson, edited by E. J. Dobson, 328; Milton and This Pendant World, by George Wesley Whiting, 329; Mechanick Exercises on the Whole Art of Printing (1683-4) by Joseph Moxon, edited by Herbert Davis and Harry Carter, 332; The English Library before 1700. Studies in its History, edited by Francis Wormald and C. E. Wright, 333; Smollett and the Scottish School. Studies in Eighteenth-Century Thought, by M. A. Goldberg, 335; Wordsworth's Cambridge Education, by Ben Ross Schneider, Jr., 337; The Early Collected Editions of Shelley's Poems, by Charles H. Taylor, Jr., 338; Anne Brontë. Her Life and Work, by Ada Harrison and Derek Stanford, and Anne Brontë. A Biography, by Winifred Gérin, 339; A Grammar of Metaphor, by Christine Brooke-Rose, 340; Short Notices, 342; Summary of Periodical Literature, 345; List of Publications Received, 350.

N;
Y;
OL
E-

he
he
not
be
is

rd

on
nt
le
m
py
n,
nd
C.
4;
n-
e
d
f
ne
5;
ic
d
r-
d
e
t,
y,
e
A
y
al

I

re

st

fr

'fo

pr

La

the

re

pla

ha

to

wi

an

tan

Pl

an

fai

the

in

the

no

niz

de

Pl

the

wh

C.

Or

bas

Ac

1

2

46

3

97-

R.E

THE DEVELOPMENT OF A THEME IN PIERS PLOWMAN

By A. C. SPEARING

IT is now generally recognized that the poem *Piers Plowman* is shot through with a network of recurrences and repetitions; and for this recognition we are largely indebted to Professor Coghill's invaluable studies of the poem and particularly to his suggestive use of analogies taken from the structure of music. It will be remembered, however, that so far as 'foretastes and echoes' of subject-matter are concerned Mr. Coghill has proposed the musical analogy only to withdraw it, on the grounds that Langland's repetitions, resulting simply from the very texture of his thought, are from an artistic point of view accidental: '. . . there is no reason for thinking that these echoes and foretastes in Langland are placed where they are to suit an exact theory of composition'.¹ This view has apparently been generally accepted;² at least, no attempt has been made to examine in detail particular examples of the recurrence of themes within *Piers Plowman*, in order to see what importance they may have for an understanding of the poem. It seems to me that they are more important than has hitherto been supposed: that thematic recurrence in *Piers Plowman* involves not merely the repetition but the development of ideas, and that failure to notice particular 'echoes' will often lead to a partial failure to understand the episodes in which they occur. Moreover, this thematic organization of the poem seems to acquire additional importance in the C-version; and I would suggest that many of the alterations made by the C-reviser, whoever he may have been (a question with which I am not here concerned), can be understood only when this has been recognized. In support of these views I propose in this article to attempt a detailed examination of a single example of thematic recurrence in *Piers Plowman*. The example chosen—one involving an extensive revision by the C-poet—is that of the recurrence of the ideas of hunger and bread, which links together the 'autobiographical' passage at the beginning of C. vi, the Hunger episode in C. ix, and the Activa-vita episode in C. xvi. One advantage of this example is that, although Miss Maguire in an article based on the B-version has pointed out a general relationship between Activa-vita (also called Haukyn in B) and the world of the *Visio*,³ the

¹ 'The Pardon of Piers Plowman', *Proc. Brit. Acad.*, xxx (1944), 303–57; p. 312.

² It was criticized by M. W. Bloomfield in his review of the above, *Speculum*, xxii (1947), 461–5.

³ 'The Significance of Haukyn, *Activa Vita*, in *Piers Plowman*', *R.E.S.*, xxv (1949), 97–109.

specific recurrence which I intend to discuss has not, so far as I am aware, been previously noticed.

I set aside for the moment the first passage mentioned, that from C. vi, and turn immediately to the Hunger episode. It will be recalled that the scene of this episode is the half-acre which Piers is having ploughed before setting out to lead the pilgrims on the way to Treuthe. His aim is to provide the community with that by which it may live—

For ich shal lene hem lyfplode · bote yf the lond faille,
As longe as ich lyue · for oure lordes loue in heuene.

(C. ix. 15-16)¹

And alle kynne crafty men · that conne lyue in treuthe,
Ich shal fynde hem fode · that feythfullech lybben (C. ix. 69-70)

—and this question of 'lyfplode' is central to what follows. After the recounting of Piers's 'byquyste' there is a brief general description of the activity on the half-acre, and then we are told:

Atte hye pryme Peers · let the plough stonde,
And ouer-seyh hem hym-self · ho so best wrouchte,
He sholde be hyred ther-after · when heruest-tyme come.

(C. ix. 119-21)

He finds that some of the pilgrims are not working, and threatens them that they shall not share in the harvest; at which certain of them pretend to be disabled. Piers further threatens these feigning cripples that

. . . Treuthe shal teche ȝow · hus teeme for to dryue,
Other ȝe shulle ete barliche brede · and of the brok drynke.

(C. ix. 141-2)

He is defied by 'Wastour' and by a boastful 'Brytonere', and when Piers calls on the Knight for his assistance they defy him also. In desperation, Piers sends for help to Hunger, who at once attacks the two rebels:

He bet hem so bothe · he barst neih hure guttes,
Ne hadde Peers with a peese-lof · prayede hym by-leue.
'Honger, haue mercy of hem,' quath Peers · 'and let me ȝeue hem benes;
And that was bake for Bayarde · may be here bote.'

(C. ix. 175-8)

The pilgrims now work vigorously, and obey Piers's orders:

Ther was no lad that lyuede · that ne lowede hym to Peers,
To be hus hole hewe · thauh he hadde no more
Bute lyf-lode for hus labour · and hus loue at nones. (C. ix. 194-6)²

¹ All Langland quotations are taken from the parallel-text edition, ed. W. W. Skeat (Oxford, 1886).

² For 'loue' (196) the edition cited has 'lone', which I assume to be a misprint.

But Piers begins to have pity on them, and asks Hunger to go away again, but first to tell him how to deal with this problem of unwillingness to work:

'Hit is no thyng for *loue* · thei labour thus faste,
 Bote for fere of famyn · in faith,' seide Peers;
 'Ys no final *loue* with this folke · for al here faire speche;
 And hit ben my blody brothren · for god bouthe vs alle.
 Treuthe taughte me ones · to *louye* hem echone,
 And helpen hem of alle thyng · ay as hem nedeth.
 Now wolde ich wite, or thow wentest · what were the beste,
 How ich myghte a-maistren hem · to *louye* and laboure
 For here lyfode; · lere me, syre Hunger.'

(C. ix. 214-22)

This passage has been considerably altered by the C-reviser: lines 214-16 are additions to B, while lines 221-2 replace a single B-line: 'And how I myȝte amastrien hem · and make hem to worche' (B. vi. 214). It will be seen that one result of the C-revision is to introduce three additional repetitions of the word *lou(y)e*. Verbal repetition is a common rhetorical device in *Piers Plowman*, but these repetitions are not merely rhetorical in a narrow sense of the word. They are the means of introducing a new and deeper level of understanding: of suggesting that a problem which has so far been seen as merely economic ought properly to be seen as moral and spiritual. It is true that a little further on B has three repetitions of *loue*, of which only the second reappears in C—

And if thow fynde any freke · that fortune hath appyred,
 Or any maner fals men · fonde thow suche to cnowe;
 Conforte hem with thi catel · for Crystes *loue* of heuene,
Loue hem and lene hem · so lawe of god techeth:—

Alter alterius onera portate.

And alle maner of men · that thow myȝte asspye,
 That nedys ben, and nauȝty · helpe hem with thi godis,
Loue hem and lakke hem nouȝte · late god take the veniaunce . . .

(B. vi. 221-7)

—but these present love not as a total and unique solution to the economic problem, but as something to be directed only towards the special class of the needy,¹ and with further limiting phraseology ('*loue hem and lene hem . . . loue hem and lakke hem nouȝte . . .*'). C's new positioning of the repetition, which puts it (more logically) in the mouth of Piers instead of Hunger, readjusts the emphasis given to the idea presented. The root of the trouble

¹ And perhaps also that of the 'reprehensibly worthless': see Mr. Coghill's discussion of 'nauȝty' in his article, 'Langland, the "Naket", the "Nauȝty", and the Dole', *R.E.S.*, viii (1932), 303-9.

on the half-acre is a lack of love; the people must be led to love as well as to labour.

But Hunger, as is surely inevitable unless he is to step outside the bounds of his own personification, advises Piers in largely economic terms: he is to assist the wronged and the genuinely needy, but

Bolde beggeres and bygge · that mowe here bred bysynke,
With houndes bred and hors bred · hele hem when thei hunren.

(C. ix. 224-5)

This recurrent image of bread seems to take on the status of a symbol for Hunger's solution to such problems: three other passages in which it occurs have already been quoted above (one of these, C. ix. 194-6, being a C-addition), and it appears again in lines 286-7 (also a C-addition) and in line 327.¹ Bread is a natural symbol for the materialist solution to economic problems: the community under consideration is agricultural, its main activities are the ploughing, sowing, and reaping which are necessary to produce bread, and to the materialist, such as Hunger inevitably is, not considering that man does not live by bread alone (and I shall argue that the omission of any reference to this text is significant), it is a natural assumption that the community's whole object is the production of bread, and that those who will not work are best reformed by being deprived of (the best) bread. Piers, however, seems a little dubious about Hunger's advice:

'Ich wolde nat greuye God,' quath Peers · 'for al the good on erthe;
Myghte ich synneles do as thou seist?'

(C. ix. 236-7)

But Hunger bears down this doubt with a flood of authorities: he quotes Gen. iii. 19, Prov. xx. 4, and Ps. cxxvii (Vulg.) in favour of his own view, and also claims that it is supported by the parable of the talents. We may be puzzled by C's omission from this speech of Hunger's of three lines which occur in B:

Kynde witt wolde · that eche a wyght vrouȝte
Or in dykyng or in deluyng · or trauaillynge in preyeres,
Contemplatyf lyf or actyf lyf · Cryst wolde men vrouȝte.

(B. vi. 249-51)

B, following A, has here widened the sense of 'work' to include prayer, the labour of contemplation; but C's aim is that Hunger should preach a doctrine of labour in a purely materialist sense, in keeping with his own

¹ And at line 242 C quotes *In labore et sudore uultus tui uesceris pane tuo*, where B (v. 235-6) gives instead a translation which uses 'mete' for bread.

nature and with the purely material sense which he assumes for bread. C wishes to set up in this episode an absolute antithesis between the gospel of loaves preached by Hunger and the gospel of love towards which Piers aspires: hence the additional emphasis given to each of these extremes, and hence this otherwise senseless omission of lines which offer a means of bridging the gap between the two gospels.

Piers is convinced by these 'euydences . . . for hem that wolle nat swynken, | That here lyfode be lene · and lytel worth here clothes' (C. ix. 263-4—not in B), and he goes on to ask Hunger if he can suggest any remedy for the stomach-pains which afflict himself and his workers, and keep them from their work. Hunger once again proposes the only remedy which his own personified nature allows:

'Ich wot wel,' quath Hunger · 'what syknesse ȝow aileth;
ȝe haue manged ouere muche · that maketh ȝow be syke.'
(C. ix. 271-2)

The people should eat only when it is necessary; and C adds a passage repeating the doctrine of selective charity put forward in C. ix. 229-34, but this time in terms of the bread-image:

Alle that greden at thy gate · for godes loue, after fode,
Parte with hem of thy payn · of potage other of souel,
Lene hem som of thy loof · thauh thou the lasse chewe.
And thauh lyers and lacchedrawers · and lolleres knocke,
Let hem abyde tyl the bord be drawe · ac bere hem none cromes,
Til alle thyn nedye neihebores · haue none ymaked.

(C. ix. 285-90)

Piers accepts this advice with great enthusiasm, telling Hunger that he can now depart whenever he wishes; but Hunger, once called in, is not so easily dismissed: he refuses to leave until he has been satisfied with food. Piers gives a long and delightful list of the different kinds of food available—a list, however, whose purpose is not simply to delight, but also to emphasize, by its series of solid common nouns, the materialistic ethos of the episode. All the people try to appease Hunger, their task being made easier by the arrival of harvest, and he is finally sent to sleep by Gloton's ale. But now, as Piers had feared, all the original troubles reappear: Hunger has not been able to offer any permanent solution, for once he has vanished the labourers again refuse to work, and devote their energies to gorging themselves. Thus the cycle begins over again: 'By this lyfode we mote lyue · tyl Lammasse tyme' (C. ix. 314), but a material 'lyfode' can provide only this temporary satisfaction. As the *passus* draws to a close, the economic problems of the half-acre merge into those of contemporary

England. After a mention of the Statute of Labourers, the *passus* expires in a series of half-incoherent threats of the return of Hunger, accompanied by pestilence, made by the poet (or the Dreamer, or both) to the workers of fourteenth-century England. As so frequently in this poem, the general argument put forward by an episode of personification-allegory is given its final persuasive force by a particular contemporary reference: the state of Langland's England gives the most convincing demonstration of the inadequacy of Hunger's doctrine. Thus it seems to me that Father Dunning sees only half the truth when he remarks in his recent article that '... we have in the ploughing of the half-acre an exposition of how the different ranks of society are to be provided with food and clothing in a measurable manner so that they may serve God'. Hunger's teaching no doubt puts forward the most equitable scheme of which materialist economics is capable, and hence up to a point gives good advice, but we are surely intended to have reservations about its adequacy which the phrase 'so that they may serve God' does not indicate. Father Dunning's comment is the more surprising (although admittedly the meaning of the episode is clearer in C than in B, on which his article is based), since he at once goes on to declare that

... the pilgrimage outlined by Piers does not, in fact, take place in the *Visio*. The reason is, I think, because the reform of society is not possible on a corporate basis: it is achieved when each individual reforms himself. . . . This pilgrimage to Truth must be made by each of the folk on his own.¹

This is doubtless so; but how does Langland express his belief in the impossibility of the reform of society on a corporate basis, if not by presenting Hunger's proposals as, beyond a certain point, inadequate? Not that Hunger's doctrine is inhumanly harsh: it involves, as C. ix. 229-34 and 285-90 make clear, self-denial, generosity, thought for others; but the fact is that it does not solve the problem which it is intended to solve.

This problem is taken up again in the episode of *Activa-vita* in C. xvi. The feast with the Doctor of Divinity recalls our attention to the question of food, but this now begins to involve spiritual issues which it has not previously raised. Thus when Scripture is told to bring bread for Pacience and the Dreamer, 'He sette a soure loaf · and seide, "agite penitentiam"' (C. xvi. 56). And again when after the feast Pacience and Conscience set off as pilgrims,

Thenne hadde Pacience, as piligrimes hauen · in here poke vitailes,
Sobrete and symple-speche · and sothfast-byleyeue.

(C. xvi. 186-7)

¹ 'The Structure of the B-Text of *Piers Plowman*', R.E.S., N.S. vii (1956), 225-37; pp. 231, 232.

The Dreamer follows them, and shortly they meet Activa-vita, who describes himself as Piers's apprentice and a minstrel; yet, he says,

Mynstralcie can ich nat muche · bote make men murye,
As a waffrer with waffres · and welcome godes gistes.
Of my labour thei lauhe · the lasse and the more.
The poure and the riche · y plese and payn fynde,
And fewe robis ich fonge · other forrede gounes.

(C. xvi. 198–202)

If we may assume with Skeat that 'godes gistes' means 'communicants',¹ and hence that 'waffres' are communion wafers, it would appear that the bread-image, reintroduced here, has been given an important new association. And this is made more likely by what follows. The image is soon repeated:

Ich haue none gode gyftes · of these grete lordes
For no bred that ich by-trauaile · to bryng by-fore lordes.
Ne were hit that the parishe · prayeth for me on Sonedayes,
Ich am sory that ich sew other sette · bote for my-self one.

(C. xvi. 209–12)

This last statement takes us back to the agricultural community of the Field or the half-acre: Activa-vita, like the workers there, grows his own corn to make bread. But at once the new association reappears, for he also claims, 'Ich fynde payn for the pope...' (C. xvi. 217). So far, then, it seems that the C-poet is reconstructing the bread-symbol which was found in the Hunger episode—and this reconstruction seems deliberate, for both line 201 and line 212 are C-additions—but with a new layer of meaning indicating the dependence of the Christian sacraments and the Church hierarchy itself on the material products of the active life. And after this we find introduced a further set of ideas which occurred in the Hunger episode: those of famine and pestilence with which it concluded. Activa-vita goes on:

Ich fynde payn for the pope · and praye hym ich wolde
That pestilences to pees · and to parfit loue turne.
For founde ich that hus blessing · and hus bulle myghte
Letten this luther eir · and lechen the syke ...
Thenne wolde ich bee busy · and buxum to helpe
Eche kynne creature · that on Cryst by-leyueth.
For sutthe he hath the power · that seynt Peter hadde,
He hath pureliche the pot · with the same salue. . . .

(C. xvi. 217–26)

The reference to 'this luther eir' (a C-addition) has the particularity and contemporaneity which we found at the end of C. ix; 'parfit loue' (also a

¹ Ed. cit., note on C. xvi. 199.

C-addition) recalls the 'final loue' of C. ix. 216 and the other earlier C-revisions concerned with love; and the Pope takes the place of the 'luthere leches' of C. ix. 296. The Pope, heir to the powers of the Apostles, is proposed as a doctor to cure the community's troubles; and it need not be decided here whether this is intended as materialistic *naïveté* on the part of Activa-vita, or as a sad irony on the part of the poet—the fact is sufficient that unfortunately the Pope's cure is no more successful than Hunger's. Activa-vita goes on to defend the Pope: it is not his own fault if he can no longer cure the sick, for they are not worthy of cure:

For may no blesyng do vs bote · bote yf we wol amende,
Ne mannes preier make pees · among Cristine peuple,
Til prude be pureliche for-do · and that thorw payn defaute;
Ex habundantia panis et uini turpissimum peccatum aduenit.
Pure plente of payn · the people of Sodomye,
And reste and riche metes · rybaudes hem made.

(C. XVI. 229-33)

These last two lines, and the Latin preceding, are additions by C,¹ and as such have in the past seemed purposeless. Thus Professor Donaldson writes.

Hawkin, in his introductory speech, tells of the duty he has of providing food for all mankind. This leads him, by a somewhat devious path, to assert that the degeneration of the people of Sodom was caused by an over-abundance of edibles.²

But once we realize that the passage is to be understood not simply in its own right but with reference to a preceding episode, it becomes clear that the path taken by Activa-vita is not at all devious: on the contrary, it is a direct path to a crucial stage in the argument. For he has now, in despairing of the Pope's power to heal, returned precisely to Hunger's remedy for the troubles of the community: 'payn defaute'. This point is driven home by the Latin quotation, which succinctly recapitulates the moral theory put forward by Hunger: that sin is caused by too much bread.

¹ Based, however, on some lines which come later in B:

And ouer-plente maketh pruyde · amonges pore and riche;
Ac mesure is so moche worth · it may nouȝte be to dere,
For the meschief and the meschaunce · amonges men of Sodome
Wex thorw plente of payn · and of pure sleuthe;
Ociositas et habundancia panis peccatum turpissimum nutrit.

(B. XIV. 73-76)

B gives these lines to Pacience; the reviser (as in C. ix), making the assignment of the speeches more logical and sharpening the antithesis between opposite principles, gives them to Activa-vita.

² *Piers Plowman: the C-Text and its Poet* (New Haven, 1949), p. 176.

Thus the wheel has come full circle; but this time we are not to be confined to the mere repetition of a remedy whose inadequacy has already been demonstrated. For Pacience, a new value, is present,¹ and the theme of the Hunger episode can now be further developed. The development, however, is clearer in C than in B, for B at this point complicates the issue with a passage of some 240 lines, in the course of which Activa-vita's coat is shown to be soiled with all the seven deadly sins, and Conscience acts as his confessor. This apparent repetition of matter already dealt with at an earlier stage of the poem no doubt plays an important part in the development of the B-text; here, however, I am only concerned with C, where the material concerning the sins has either been omitted or else transferred back to C. vii–viii, and immediately upon Activa-vita's reiteration of Hunger's doctrine there follows a contradiction by Pacience:

'Pees!' quath Pacience · 'ich praye the, syre Actyf!
For thauh neuere payn ne plough · ne potage were,
Prude wolde putte hym-self forth · thauh no plough erye.'
(C. XVI. 234–6)

These lines, which are not in B, represent an important step forward: the root of evil, pride, the head of the sins, and, as we later learn, that which prevents the Dreamer from progressing in his quest,² has after all nothing to do with bread. But if (as follows from this) the materialist remedy against pride is not sufficient, what is sufficient? Pacience tells us:

Hit am ich that fynde alle folke · and fram hunger sauе,
Thorgh the heye helpe of hym · that me hyder sente,
. . . lo, here lyf-lode ynowe · yf oure by-leyue be trewe!
For lent was ther neuere lyf · bote lyflode were yshape, . . .
In menyng that alle men · myghte the same
Lyuen thorgh leill by-leyue · as oure lord wittnesseth,
*Quodcumque petieritis patrem in nomine meo, dabitur enim
uobis; et alibi:*
*Non in solo pane uiuit homo, sed de omni verbo, quod
procedit de ore dei.*

(C. XVI. 237–46)

¹ Cf. Maguire, p. 99: 'This introduction of Patience, and especially the placing of him in immediate contact with the Dreamer, is significant. It marks the beginning of the change in the Dreamer's approach to his difficulties.'

² See the exchange between the Dreamer and Liberum-Arbitrium on the latter's first appearance:

'Alle the science vnder sonne · and alle sotile craftes
Ich wolde ich knewe and couthe · kyndeliche in myn herte.'
'Thanne art thou inparfyte,' quath he · 'and on of Prydes knyghtes;
For suche a luste and lykyng · Lucifer fel fro heuene. . .'.
(C. XVII. 210–13)

The remedy is a spiritual remedy, patience, which the individual must apply for himself; and all that bread has come to symbolize is finally dismissed by the Scriptural text which was missing from C. ix: *Non in solo pane uiuit homo*. The individual nature of the remedy is emphasized by what follows: Activa-vita asks to see some of this food by which man lives and by which he is really saved from Hunger, and it turns out to be 'A pece of the pater-noster, . . . fiat-uoluntas-tua' (C. xvi. 249-51)—

'Haue, Actyf,' quath Pacience · 'and eet this when the hunghreth,
Other whenne thou clomsest for colde · other clyngest for drouthe;
And shal neuere gyues the greue · ne grete lordes wratthe,
Pryson ne other Payne · for—pacientes uincunt.'

(C. xvi. 252-5)

The problem of 'lyflore', which had appeared to be an economic problem, and had then seemed insoluble, is now shown to be a spiritual problem, whose solution is the submission of the will of the individual to the will of God. The episode now merges into a long disquisition on Patient Poverty; and here, for our purposes, it can be considered to end, with the bringing into actuality of what had seemed to be latent in the Hunger episode.¹

And now that we have followed out this development of its theme, I think we can return to the Hunger episode with a new understanding of the C-poet's intention. For not only was the succeeding development latent in this episode, but there is some evidence that the careful reader or listener was intended to feel that it was latent. In the 'autobiographical' passage added in C between the first and second visions, the Dreamer, berated by Reson for wasting his time, replies:

¹ The next section of the poem continues to draw allusively on what precedes, though without developing the bread-image any further. Thus the episode of the feast is recalled when Pacience, emphasizing man's reliance on God, tells Activa-vita,

. . . thorw hus breth bestes lyuen · bothe men and fuisse,
As wytnessest holy wryte · when we seyn oure graces,
Aperis tu manum tuam, et imples omne animal benedictione.

(C. xvi. 265-6)

And in the following passus Liberum-Arbitrium, describing Charite to the Dreamer, makes use of texts which will now be familiar to us:

Of rentes ne of richesses. . . . reccheth he neuere,
A frend he hath that fyt him · that faileth him neuere.
On *Aperis-tu-manum* · alle thyngs hym fyndeth;
Fiat-uoluntas-tua · festeth hym ech day.

(C. xvii. 315-18)

Passus XVII and the *Vita de Dowel* end (in C only) by quoting *Panem nostrum cotidianum da nobis hodie*, a sentence which rounds off the preceding thematic development, and in doing so takes on a meaning richer and yet more precise than it could have had at any earlier stage of the poem.

'... rebuke me ryght nouht · Reson, ich ȝow praye;
 For in my conscience ich knowe · what Crist wolde that ich wrouhte.
 Preyers of a parfyte man · and penaunce discret
 Ys the leueste labour · that oure lord pleseth.
Non de solo, ich seide · 'for sothe *uiuit homo*,
Nec in pane & pabulo · the *pater-noster* witnesseth;
Fiat uoluntas tua · fynt ous alle thynges.'

(C. vi. 82-88)

Thus a passage containing not only the ideas of *Non in solo pane uiuit homo* and *Fiat uoluntas tua*, but also a reference to the concept of labouring in prayer similar to that omitted in C. ix as bridging the gap between contemplation and physical labour, has been used by the Dreamer in defence of his own way of life.¹ Here, then, the way of escape from the vicious circle of C. ix has already been indicated; but it is the particularity of its application which enables us to see its recurrence in C. xvi as a development and not merely a repetition. In C. vi the ideas are brought forward by the Dreamer on the spur of the moment, applied only to his personal case, and quickly glossed over:

Quath Conscience, 'by Crist · ich can nat see this lyeth;
 Ac it semeth nouht parfytnesse · in cytees for to begge,
 Bote he be obediencer · to pryour other to mynstre.'

(C. vi. 89-91)

These ideas, known only superficially, can be used in C. vi in rather glib self-justification, but it is not until a later stage of the poem (indicated by the appearance of Pacience) that they are understood sufficiently deeply for it to be realized that they have the scope of absolutely prescriptive principles, invalidating the doctrines of materialist economics. But the fact that the ideas have been mentioned must make it more likely that their absence will be noticed in the economic context of C. ix, where the bread-image receives so much stress.

It may be, of course, that the brief 'foretaste' of C. vi would have passed unnoticed or been forgotten; even so, there are more general arguments for supposing that some at least of the poet's audience would have been aware

¹ It might be added that the feigning cripples on the half-acre, with their promise to pray for Piers and his workers—

Ac we prayeth for ȝow, Peers · and for ȝoure plough bothe,
 That god for his grace · ȝoure grayn multiplie,
 And ȝelde ȝow of ȝoure almesse · that ȝe ȝeuuen us here.

(C. ix. 131-3)

—are a sort of parody of the contemplative life, while Piers's rebuke to them—'ȝoure praieris, ... and ȝe parfit were, | Myght help, as ich hope. . .' (C. ix. 136-7—not in B)—repeats, in its emphasis on the need for perfection if prayers are to be of any value, the Dreamer's remark to Reson quoted above.

in C. IX that there was more to be said, and that the conclusion was inconclusive. *Piers Plowman*, varying greatly from one part to another in its degree of difficulty, was surely intended for a widely inclusive audience;¹ and if the 'lewed' were aware only of repetitions and the straightforward exposition of doctrine, the judicious, familiar with elaborate sermons constructed with the aid of *concordantiae* and lists of *distinctiones*,² would surely have seen many common Scriptural images as exemplifying themes, and hence as pregnant with potential meanings—would have felt the image of bread to be pregnant with the text *Nor in solo pane uiuit homo*. This sense of the pregnancy of Biblical images is something which would naturally be exploited in a poem, like *Piers Plowman*, of spiritual quest: a poem which progresses through a gradually deepening understanding of truths already given. And yet little allowance has been made in recent interpretations of *Piers Plowman* for the pregnancy of its language, and for the development of doctrine which this makes possible. Professors Robertson and Huppé, it is true, have attempted a reading in the light of Biblical commentaries; but they would arbitrarily make the 'higher' meaning of images totally present at any point. Thus (to return to the Hunger episode) they write of B. vi. 135-40:

The barley bread may be taken to represent temporal rather than spiritual bread; the water, the opposite of the honey of sapientia, is 'dulcedo hujus vitae'. The blind, the lame and the imprisoned are those who are caught in the world but who desire spiritual food. God will amend them. The wheaten bread is the body Christ [sic], and their drink is the wine of the Sacrament; in other words, they receive the spiritual food of the word of God.³

And they go on to claim, on the authority of Bede and Bonaventure, that 'Hunger represents tropologically the lack of spiritual food in forgetfulness of the Creator'. If, then, Langland is already at the beginning of the half-acre scene discussing the problem of spiritual hunger for spiritual bread, there can hardly be any further development of the theme: rather a regression. And indeed Robertson and Huppé want this regression to occur before the end of this very scene, for, referring to B. vi. 255-8, they write, 'Having disposed of the question of the proper handling of spiritual food,

¹ The evidence collected in J. A. Burrow's valuable article, 'The Audience of *Piers Plowman*', *Anglia*, lxxv (1957), 373-84, is not sufficient to exclude this view, which the nature of the poem itself seems to enforce.

² Developed in the late twelfth and thirteenth centuries: see Beryl Smalley, *The Study of the Bible in the Middle Ages* (2nd edn., Oxford, 1952), pp. 241, 247-8.

³ It is worth noting that C, by altering B. vi. 139, spoils the alleged dichotomy between barley bread and wheaten bread, so that the Robertson and Huppé theory involves us in assuming that the C-reviser did not know his business. If a man (supposing he was not the B-poet) who set out to revise the B-text in detail did not understand what Robertson and Huppé suppose to be its meaning, we may perhaps be pardoned for doubting whether any contemporary audience would have understood it.

Piers asks concerning temporal food and its interference with spiritual work.' There is, of course, no warrant whatever in the text of the poem for this sudden reduction in the meaning of the bread-image; and it is not surprising that, having thus shattered the continuity of a perfectly coherent scene, the two writers should feel obliged to remark that

The events in the episode should not be taken to represent a temporal sequence, nor should the fact that Piers is instructed by Hunger be taken to represent any actual ignorance on his part. By presenting various situations the poet is simply showing what Piers is, or what the good prelate should be.¹

Against this arbitrary and unrestricted allegoricism the 'literal' interpretation of the poem on which Professor Frank has more recently insisted is an understandable reaction. He writes of the whole episode on the half-acre:

The faithful laborers in the field may suggest—certainly they parallel rather than contradict—the image of the man of good works. But the scene is to be read literally. The poet treats the issues of feudal duty, rebellious laborers, beggars, and famine with the passion of an inspired pamphleteer.

And on the *Activa-vita* episode (admittedly as it appears in the B-version) Professor Frank comments:

That is the poet's main purpose in creating Haukyn: to show how living in the world, breadwinning, the Active Life, inevitably involves man in sin.²

Yet even as literal readings of the poem these comments are hardly satisfactory, for they leave out of account the pregnant nature of the language used by Langland—and this is surely not to be thought of as an 'allegorical' quality—and hence lead to an unnecessarily impoverished understanding of his poem, an understanding which makes it less of a connected whole than it in fact is.

I have argued that the preceding examination of the relationships between three episodes in *Piers Plowman* enables us to see some sense in the activities of the C-reviser; and this newly discovered purposefulness in paths which had previously seemed devious must surely give greater probability to the reading here put forward (though I would not, of course, claim that this reading exhausts the meaning of the episodes concerned). I believe that the particular case considered provides a fairly typical example of Langland's general methods of working, and hence that a study of the 'echoes and foretastes' in *Piers Plowman* will be important for an understanding of the structure underlying the poem's sometimes confusing surface. I hope at least that this article will serve to call attention to the need for a closer examination of the kind of poem *Piers Plowman* is, and of the light thrown on this question by the C-revision.

¹ *Piers Plowman and Scriptural Tradition* (Princeton, 1951), pp. 83-84, 88, 90.

² *Piers Plowman and the Scheme of Salvation* (New Haven, 1957), pp. 23, 71.

SPENSER'S PENSION

By HERBERT BERRY and E. K. TIMINGS

EDMUND SPENSER was granted a pension of £50 a year on 25 February 1591, which has long had an important place in biographies of him. Apart from being one of the important events in his life, the pension has been useful in one of the much-discussed questions of Spenserian biography: whether he was as poor as some of his contemporaries made him, especially Jonson, who said he died of starvation. Yet no one, apparently, has ever looked seriously for the details of payment—to find when the pension was paid and (since Spenser was in Ireland much of the time) to whom. No one has even inquired whether Spenser collected the payment due when he was dying in London. Instead, writers have varied from Broadus, who guessed, curiously, that the pension was never paid,¹ to Sidney Lee and J. W. Hales, H. S. V. Jones, and A. C. Judson, who with better sense guessed the reverse.² These and others have been steering a variety of wary courses between accepting Jonson's remarks at face value and denying them outright. A few have been so wary as to come close to doing both.³ But there are eight rolls of Exchequer accounts and two books of Audit Office accounts surviving for the period of Spenser's pension, and each contains at least one record of payment.

Five of the Exchequer rolls are tellers' rolls and three are issue rolls. Each tellers' roll records separately the accounts of each teller for the two terms into which the Exchequer divided the year, Michaelmas term, running from Michaelmas Day of one year until the cessation of business before Easter of the next, and Easter term, running from the resumption of business after Easter until the day before Michaelmas. These rolls survive for 1590–1, 1593–4, 1594–5, 1597–8, and 1598–9. They do not give the date of any transaction beyond the term. The issue rolls, on the other hand, are a day-to-day account of money paid out during one of the two terms, regardless of teller. They do record the date of each transaction. Those surviving are for terms also covered by the tellers' rolls—Michaelmas term 1597–8; Easter term 1598; and Michaelmas term 1598–9. The Audit Office books are issue books; they are much like the Exchequer issue rolls, and those which survive cover the same terms.

¹ *The Laureateship* (Oxford, 1921), p. 35.

² D.N.B.; *A Spenser Handbook* (New York, 1930), p. 36; and *The Life of Edmund Spenser* (Baltimore, 1945), pp. 155, 203–4.

³ For example, B.E.C. Davis, *Edmund Spenser* (Cambridge, 1933), pp. 56–57, and Mrs. Bennett's article mentioned below.

Like many others, Spenser's pension was to be paid for life in four equal instalments annually, due at Lady Day (25 March), the Nativity of John the Baptist (24 June), Michaelmas, and Christmas.¹ For the odd period at the beginning, and presumably for that at the end, the teller reckoned the pension at 2s. 8*½d.* per day. Spenser was placed—and as the practice was, remained—in the accounts of the teller Robert Tailor.

When the pension was granted Spenser had been in England for some time, during which he had seen through the publication of the first three books of the *Faerie Queene* by the stationer William Ponsonby. Spenser probably returned to Ireland before the first payment was due on Lady Day, having left some of his financial as well as literary affairs in the hands of Ponsonby. The first payment covered the twenty-eight days beginning on 26 February and was correctly reckoned at 76s. 5d. The money was collected by Edward Blunt (or Blount),² a young man who three years before had finished a ten-year apprenticeship with Ponsonby and was probably still with him. Blunt did not set up on his own until 1594; during a long and successful career, he published Marlowe's *Hero and Leander*, Florio's translation of Montaigne, and with Jaggard and two others the first folio of Shakespeare's plays. Like Spenser, incidentally, Blunt was the son of a merchant tailor.³

Ponsonby went himself for the next payment, the first regular one, due for the quarter ending on 24 June. He received £12. 10s.⁴ There the record stops, for the two tellers' rolls and four issue rolls on which the eight following payments were entered have been lost. The next payment of which record survives was that for the quarter ending at Michaelmas 1593. One Richard Wilson collected another £12. 10s.⁵

After this payment Spenser ceased taking quarterly payments in favour generally of half-yearly ones, and so saved himself and others the trouble of at least two transactions a year. The next payment, therefore, was of £25 for the two quarters ending on Lady Day 1594. One Ralph Warde, gentleman, collected the sum.⁶

¹ F. I. Carpenter, *A Reference Guide to Edmund Spenser* (Chicago, 1923), p. 70. The correct citation, which Carpenter did not use, is C. 66/1364, m. 41. Another description of the pension, a copy of that in the patent roll, may be found in the auditor's patent book, E. 403/2453, f. 183.

² E. 405/148, m. 88.

³ A *Transcript of the Registers of the Company of Stationers of London, 1554-1640* ed. E. Arber (London, 1875), ii. 86, 650, 702; iii. 105, 162; iv. 107, &c.

⁴ E. 405/148, m. 99.

⁵ E. 405/149, m. 30.

⁶ E. 405/149, m. 81. A person of this name, of Colnbrook, Bucks., leased the church and other properties of Tintagel, Cornwall, 'to farm', as his father, John, had done before him. In June 1599, three years before the lease was to expire, he sued the Dean and Canons of the Free Chapel of Windsor Castle for a renewal. See C. 3. 294/19.

Similarly, Spenser skipped the quarterly sum due on 24 June, two weeks after his marriage to Elizabeth Boyle. George Dryden, a first cousin of the bride, then took the £25 for two quarters ending at Michaelmas.¹ Dryden was a brother of Sir Erasmus Dryden, of whom Spenser was 'an acquaintance and frequenter', in the words of Aubrey, who had the information from the poet, John Dryden, a great grandson of Sir Erasmus.² George Dryden died in February 1603.³

The next half-yearly payment was due on Lady Day 1595. But no record of such a payment occurs in the Easter portion of the tellers' roll for that year, nor in the Michaelmas portion preceding. Possibly Spenser delayed having the money collected so that he could collect in person the full yearly sum which would be due at Michaelmas, or even the sum for five quarters at Christmas, for he returned to England during the winter of 1595–6. The two tellers' and four issue rolls which recorded how he took payments when he was in England are lost.

He seems to have left England again late in 1596, perhaps having collected himself the money due at Christmas of that year. In any case, two quarters later someone must have collected money for him, for at Christmas 1597 he had a half-year's money due to him (the rolls resume and the books begin with the Michaelmas term). Thomas Walker, gentleman, collected the £25 on 31 January 1598, and at the same time he collected a quarterly payment of his own annuity.⁴ Walker's annuity was worth 20*d.* a day; it was in the accounts of the same teller as Spenser's and payable at the same quarters. He had acquired it the year before, on 14 April, the result of 'long and faithful service' to the Queen, and two small annuities totalling 20*d.* a day which he had somehow secured from Walter Lloyd and Edward Stringer.⁵ Lloyd's annuity had been granted for strenuous military service in Ireland. Probably Walker had bought the two smaller annuities and then managed to get them transferred to his life. It was a shrewd manœuvre, for he lived to collect the money for twenty-eight years. He died on 17 March 1625.⁶

¹ E. 405/150, m. 34. George and Sir Erasmus were the sons of John Dryden of Canons Ashby, Northants., and his wife, Elizabeth Cope. Elizabeth Boyle's mother was Joan Cope, a sister of Elizabeth Cope. See John Dryden's will, P.C.C. 24 Watson, and the genealogy by W. H. Welby in *N. & Q.*, clxii (1932), 166.

² *Brief Lives*, ed. Clark (Oxford, 1898), ii. 232. Sir Erasmus was the eldest son surviving and George the second when John Dryden died in 1584.

³ George Dryden's will was dated 12 Feb. and proved 26 Feb. 1603; see P.C.C. 9 Bolein.

⁴ E. 405/151, m. 21, E. 403/865, m. 40, and E. 403/1693 (by date). Walker's payments appear regularly every quarter; see E. 403/865, m. 12, 40, 57, &c.

⁵ Walker's patent is in C. 66/1462, m. 21, and mention of it in *C.S.P., Dom.*, 1595–97, p. 390.

⁶ E. 403/2370 (2), f. 2a.

This person may be the Thomas Walker whom lawsuits in 1596 and 1598 show to be dealing in such things as loans and wardships.¹ Activities of this kind are quite in keeping with the acquisition of Lloyd's and Stringer's annuities. This Thomas Walker lived at New Windsor, Berks., in 1596 and was thirty-five years old in April 1594. His father was Anthony Walker, gentleman, who had owned many houses and parcels of land in London, including extensive properties at Battersea, where he lived; he died in 1590.² If these two Walkers are the same, then Spenser had probably sold him two or three payments of his pension—at a discount, of course. A Thomas Walker, who might well be the same person again, was Keeper of the House at Whitehall during the winter of 1596–7.³

Walker also collected Spenser's next payment, another half-yearly one, on 26 August 1598.⁴ He had collected his own quarterly payment much earlier, on 29 June. Both payments had been due on 24 June.

The next half-yearly payment was due at Christmas; it was to be the last payment of all. Spenser arrived in London in time to deliver dispatches which were read at court on 24 December. On 30 December, as Mrs. Bennett reported, he received £8 for carrying the dispatches from Ireland.⁵ Two weeks later, on 13 January, he died. A month and a half later still, on 28 February, Henry Vincent, gentleman, collected the £25 due to Spenser at Christmas, and in the tellers' roll this payment appears exactly as the previous ones.⁶ Twenty years afterwards Jonson told Drummond of Hawthornden that Spenser had 'died for lack of bread in King street and refused 20 pieces sent to him by my Lord of Essex & said he was sorrie he had no time to spend them'.⁷

Henry Vincent may have been another of the wealthy—and distant—relatives Spenser cultivated during the 1590's. A person of the name was active near London at the time, was surely wealthy, and was perhaps a relative. He was the second son of a prosperous and well-connected family of Long Ditton, Surrey. His mother had been Elizabeth Spencer of Northamptonshire who could well have belonged to the Spencers of that

¹ C. 2 Eliz., W. w. 11/38, and C. 2 Eliz., S. s. 13/43. In the first he sued James Stanley, a scrivener, and in the second was sued by Thomas Stephens of the Middle Temple. In both suits Walker is described as having an associate, Henry Knyvett.

² See the *Inquisitions post mortem* on Anthony Walker and on William Walker, Thomas's younger brother who had become a lunatic, in Edward A. Fry, *Abstracts of Inquisitions Post Mortem Relating to the City of London* (London, 1908), iii. 154–7, 190–2.

³ A.O. 1/386/35.

⁴ E. 405/151, m. 78; E. 403/866, m. 34, 20; and E. 403/1694 (by date).

⁵ 'Did Spenser Starve?', *M.L.N.*, lii (1937), 400–1. But even Mrs. Bennett allowed that Spenser may well have had little more than bread in his last days.

⁶ E. 405/152, m. 22; E. 403/867, m. 42; and E. 403/1694 (by date). The remark that Vincent collected the money does not appear in the issue roll or Audit Office book.

⁷ Herford and Simpson, *Ben Jonson* (Oxford, 1925), i. 137.

258 BERRY AND TIMINGS: SPENSER'S PENSION

county whom the poet claimed as relatives.¹ His father, David Vincent, had prospered mightily under Henry VIII and Edward VI, and his elder brother, Thomas, so well afterwards that in 1601 the Queen herself visited his estate at Stoke D'Abernon and there knighted him. Shortly after Spenser's death, probably, Henry Vincent married a wealthy widow, Elizabeth Slyfield, and thenceforth was of West Clandon, Surrey, the estate his wife carried with her.² He died on 31 May 1631,³ and his wife seven years later. He was of the same generation as the three ladies of the Northamptonshire Spencers whom the poet praised so highly.

In 1597 and 1599 the tellers paid the Christmas instalments of annuities freely from 24 December onwards.⁴ But in 1598, when Spenser was in London for the last time, apparently they did not. Tyrone's rebellion, which had sent Spenser to London in the first place, had caused a sudden drain on the treasury. As a result, an enormous loan was forced on the City, some of the Queen's property was sold, a benevolence was demanded of lawyers rich and poor, loans were sought even from the unaffluent like John Chamberlain, and annuities were not paid in quantity until 5 February, more than three weeks after Spenser had died.⁵ The tellers made twenty-three payments on eight days between Christmas and the day of Spenser's death, all except one for important affairs of state, chiefly military matters for Ireland. The one exception, however, was just such a payment as was due to Spenser: the Countess of Kent and her son collected on 29 December the £100 due to them at Christmas for their annuity. The only other such payment before 5 February was £250 to the Earl of Oxford on 31 January.⁶

But the money due to Spenser could not have been lost to him. If he had really wanted it, he probably could have done as well as the Countess

¹ The Vincents were also originally of Northamptonshire. David moved his part of the family to Surrey, and his son, Sir Thomas, sold the estates in Northamptonshire to Burleigh.

² O. Manning, *The History and Antiquities of the County of Surrey*, ed. Bray (London, 1809), ii. 723, 725; iii. 13, 54; and *Victoria History of the County of Surrey* (London, 1911), iii. 347. See also *Surrey Archaeological Collections* (London, 1912), xxv. 94. Sir Thomas Vincent was probably a good deal older than Henry; he was twenty-one in 1565 when his father died, and his son sixty 'or more' when Henry died. Sir Thomas died in 1613.

³ I.p.m. C. 142/487/14.

⁴ E. 403/865, m. 30 ff., and E. 403/869, m. 22 ff. In 1597 two such annuities were paid as early as 23 Dec.

⁵ *The Letters of John Chamberlain*, ed. N. E. McClure (Philadelphia, 1939), i, 56, 59, 61, 66, 68, 72. Between Michaelmas and 24 Dec. the tellers paid £119,548, some £10,965 more than in 1597 and £12,942 more than in 1599. Before the annuities were paid on 5 Feb. the total outlay was £167,879, or £35,771 more than in 1597-8, but only £3,524 more than in 1599-1600; these last two figures included, of course, payment of nearly all the annuities. Chamberlain suspected on 8 Dec. that the drain was not so great as the alarm; but the Queen's officers anticipated a much greater drain once Essex's expedition was on foot in the spring.

⁶ E. 403/867, m. 27 ff. Payments were made on 27 and 29 Dec.; 3, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13 Jan.

and her son, through his friends at court if no other way. Failing this, he would have had no trouble whatever in selling his right to the payment at a discount. Stringer and Lloyd, after all, had probably done as much with their entire pensions, and Spenser himself, perhaps, with the payments immediately after his previous visit to London. Indeed, one must hold out the possibility that Spenser did something of the sort, and that Vincent was the person who accommodated him.

What value can now be put on Jonson's remarks? The first part must be dismissed as false. Either Spenser could have had £20 to £25 more than he had and chose not to have it, or he did have rather less than £33 as an absolute minimum. In either case, he was a very long way from dying for lack of bread. The second part? Could it have had its genesis in the money which Spenser might have had, but probably chose not to have?

For the nineteen days beginning on 26 December and ending with the day of Spenser's death the heirs might have collected £2. 11s. 10*½*d. Others collected such sums apparently as a matter of course. But the Exchequer rolls and the Audit Office books do not contain a record that the Spensers collected the money due to them.¹ Probably the amount was too small to bother about so many miles away and in the midst of Tyrone's rebellion.

¹ E. 403/867-9 (to the end of Mich. 1600); E. 405/152-6 (to the end of Mich. 1602-3); and E. 403/1695 (Easter and Mich. 1599).

ent,
der
ited
fter
ow,
the
wife
the
ties
s in
ion,
den
the
ded
like
ary,
nty-
ser's
tters
was
mber
such
ary.
f he
ntess
of the
re to
ndon,
ndon,
. Sir
1565
ied in

e paid

9, 61,
0,965
aid on
3,524
rly all
as the
dition

3 Jan.

AREOPAGITICA AND A FORGOTTEN LICENSING CONTROVERSY

By ERNEST SIRLUCK

WHEN the House of Commons in 1695 refused to concur with the House of Lords in renewing the Printing Act of 1662, licensing of the press in England came permanently to an end. But the reasons which the Lower House gave for its action had nothing to do with the desirability of a free press. The Commons' criticism of the act they were allowing to expire was not that its object was bad, but that experience had shown the instrument to be hopelessly inefficient, impossible to administer, and gravely subject to favouritism and abuse.¹ Their intent was clearly not to vacate legislative control of publication but to start afresh with a new law, in preference to protracting yet again the life of the oft-renewed Act of 1662;² and in fact they brought a bill to that purpose through a second reading by November,³ but the session ended without a third reading.

Every historian of the emancipation of the press has been struck by the ironical disparity between the intent of the Commons and the tremendous consequences of their action. Macaulay set the tone of future comment:

They knew not what they were doing, what a revolution they were making, what a power they were calling into existence. They pointed out . . . the absurdities and iniquities of the statute which was about to expire. But all their objections will be found to relate to matters of detail. On the great question of principle, on the question whether the liberty of unlicensed printing be, on the whole, a blessing or a curse to society, not a word is said.⁴

After listing a number of the Commons' objections, the great admirer of Milton could not resist drawing the contrast: 'Such were the arguments which did what Milton's Areopagitica failed to do.' Laurence Hanson, pointing out in the same way that the Commons were motivated by 'no sudden access of enlightenment', adds: 'That the lapse of the Licensing Act should have been succeeded by no immediate legislation was accidental rather than of set purpose. . . . The press indeed remained free, largely because of the quarrel between the two Houses of Parliament. . . .'⁵ So too

¹ *Lords Journals*, xv. 545–6.

² Renewed 1664, 1665; lapsed 1679; revived 1685; renewed 1692. See F. S. Siebert, *Freedom of the Press in England 1476–1776* (Urbana, 1952), pp. 237–8, 260–3.

³ *Commons Journals*, xi. 340, 354.

⁴ Book III, chap. 21.

⁵ *Government and the Press 1695–1763* (Oxford, 1936), pp. 7–8.

Fredrick S. Siebert, who also finds that the House was moved by 'the practical reasons arising from the difficulties of administration and the restraint of trade'.¹ Pointing out that the Commons' reply was based on a paper by Locke, Siebert too notices the contrast with *Areopagitica*: 'Unlike Milton, Locke grounded his arguments principally on the unnatural monopolies of the Stationers Company, on the vague and general terms of prohibition, and on the adequacy of prosecutions at common law. Nothing was said about the universal principle of freedom of the press' (p. 261).

What seems not to have been noticed (or rather to have been forgotten, for it was at least partly known as late as 1819) is that when, two years later, a series of efforts was begun to reintroduce licensing, just such a debate was precipitated as was so remarkably absent in 1695. The discussion did not at the outset rise to this level, certainly not in Parliament. The first occasion was the attempt, by a group of financial speculators, to depress the Exchequer Bills by means of a rumour in a venal newspaper named *The Flying Post*. The infuriated Commons instantly arrested the editor, and, without dividing, called for a Bill to prevent the publishing of news without a licence. Pulteney brought the Bill in within two days, and the House's anger carried it through a first reading; but by the second reading the mood had changed and the Bill was rejected. Nicholas Tindal explains that 'though they saw the mischiefs of the liberty of the press, they knew not where to fix the restraint'.² Macaulay believes the House's reversal was due largely to the members' reluctance to be deprived of what had become one of their chief out-of-town pleasures, the competitive private newspapers.³

But as, during the next few years, bill followed bill—all, for one reason or another, failing to reach enactment⁴—a small pamphlet war developed in which, on the one hand, unlicensed printing was proclaimed the fundamental safeguard of all religious and civil liberty, without which society must sink into ecclesiastical and secular tyranny; and, on the other hand, licensing was defended as the necessary preservative of truth and order in church and state, as much the magistrate's duty as his right. What was responsible for the change in the nature of the discussion from 1695?

Such things are unlikely to be due to a single cause, but, with due allowance made for the complexities of controversy, I think it can be shown that the change is a direct reflection of the influence of Milton's *Areopagitica* (most probably through its republication in the anonymous collection of Milton's English prose of 1697 or in Toland's collection of 1698). Indeed,

¹ *Freedom of the Press*, p. 263.

² *The Continuation of Mr. Rapin de Thoyras's History of England* (2nd edn., London, 1751), i. 350.

³ Book III, chap. 22.

⁴ Hanson, pp. 8–9.

the form that the controversy over licensing took in 1698, and the difference between what the champion of a free press said in that year and what he had said in an immediately preceding book of the year before, constitute that rare thing in the history of ideas, a case history of the birth of an influence.

II

The central document is a quarto pamphlet of thirty-two pages, published in 1698, entitled *A Letter To a Member of Parliament, Shewing, that a Restraint On the Press Is inconsistent with the Protestant Religion, and dangerous to the Liberties of the Nation*, hereafter cited as *A Letter* (1698). This pamphlet is unknown to Halkett and Laing,¹ and it is not referred to by either Siebert, the best historian of the struggle for freedom of the press in England during the period, or Sensabaugh, whose account of the influence of Milton's prose from the Restoration to the accession of Anne is the most comprehensive so far published.²

A Letter (1698) was not always so obscure, however, nor was its connexion with Milton always unrecognized. It provoked at least two full-scale replies in 1698 and 1699,³ went into a second edition in 1700,⁴ was abridged in a pamphlet of 1704,⁵ and was reprinted two years later in the very important *State Tracts* of 1705–7.⁶ After this initial decade of prominence it seems to have fallen out of sight for a century, until Cobbett reprinted it in 1809 (its last appearance).⁷

The British Museum Catalogue and Wing (L1680) list it without attribution, but it is demonstrably by the celebrated deist Mathew Tindal. T. Holt White seems to have known this, as we may infer from a passage unaccountably neglected by later editors of Milton and by students of his influence:

Mathew Tindal writing in 1698 against Mr. Pulteney's Bill to provide, with other restrictions on the Press, that no unlicensed Newspaper should be in circulation, transcribed from it [*Areopagitica*] without scruple, with little alteration and without acknowledgement. It is not unlikely he was apprehensive, that the name of MILTON would have been detrimental to the cause for which he was ably and anxiously contending!⁸

White does not name the work by Tindal to which he is referring, and his

¹ *Dictionary of Anonymous and Pseudonymous English Literature* (London, 1926–56).

² G. F. Sensabaugh, *That Grand Whig Milton* (Stanford, 1952).

³ See below, pp. 272–3.

⁴ *Term Catalogues*, iii. 181; Wing, L1681.

⁵ See below, p. 273.

⁶ *A Collection of State Tracts, Publish'd on Occasion of the Late Revolution in 1688. And during the Reign of King William III* (London, 1705–7), ii. 614–26.

⁷ Cobbett's *Parliamentary History of England* (London, 1806–12), v, col. 1164.

⁸ *Areopagitica* (London, 1819), p. lvii.

documentation here gives no clue;¹ furthermore, *A Letter* (1698) was not written against Pulteney's Bill, which had been killed before the publication of the pamphlet which caused Tindal to write *A Letter* (1698);² nevertheless, once it is seen that *A Letter* (1698) is Tindal's it becomes clear that it must be the pamphlet White meant. Hanson, in his bibliography of sources for the relations of government and press during the period, lists *A Letter* (1698) as Tindal's (p. 128), but he neither discusses the pamphlet nor explains his attribution.

What demonstrates Tindal's authorship is that *A Letter* (1698) is the second of a sequence of three works visibly by the same hand, the other two known certainly to be by Tindal. In 1697 he published *An Essay Concerning the Power of the Magistrate, and the Rights of Mankind, in Matters of Religion*, which contains a 'Postscript' promising that his 'next Discourse' will be on freedom of the press.³ *A Letter* (1698) repeats a good deal of *An Essay* (1697), often transcribing large passages verbatim.⁴ Then in 1704 Tindal published *Reasons Against Restraining the Press*,⁵ which is an abridgement of *A Letter* (1698).⁶ It may be added that *An Essay* (1697) and *A Letter* (1698) were printed and sold by the same men. The former imprint reads 'London, Printed by J.D. for Andrew Bell at the Cross-Keys and Bible in Cornhill', and the latter 'Printed by J. Darby, and sold by Andr. Bell at the Cross-Keys and Bible in Cornhill'.⁷

An Essay (1697) falls into two parts. The main portion (to p. 176) is a well-written, carefully argued plea, in the tradition of Locke, for religious toleration. It does not concern itself with liberty of the press, except that on two occasions the phrase is added to the general argument for liberty of the pulpit.⁸ An unlicensed press is certainly implicit in the toleration demanded by *An Essay* (1697), but Tindal was not thinking about it at the moment, and in the main part of the book referred to it only in this very casual way.

¹ White's references are to Nicholas Tindal's *Continuation of Rapin* and James Ralph's *History of England* (London, 1744-6). Both give the account of the failure of Pulteney's Bill but neither mentions any publications on the subject.

² For this, and for the probable basis of White's mistake, see below, pp. 264-5 and p. 265, n. 2.

³ P. 187; and see below, p. 265. Attribution by Wood, accepted by D.N.B. and all bibliographies.

⁴ Compare *A Letter* (1698), title; pp. 3-4, 14, 12-13, 13, 17, 18, and 22 with *An Essay* (1697), headings of Part I, chap. 4, and Part II, chap. 5; pp. 31-32 and 87-88, 119-20, 122-3, 123-4, 32-33, 126, and 155.

⁵ Attribution by Richard Barron, *Pillars of Priestcraft* (2nd edn., London, 1768), iv. 281; accepted by D.N.B. and all bibliographies.

⁶ See below, p. 273.

⁷ Darby also printed John Toland's *Life of John Milton* (1699), and since this was reprinted from Toland's edition of Milton's prose works in 1698, Darby may also have been the anonymous London printer of that volume who concealed his work under the false 'Amsterdam' imprint.

⁸ Pp. 104 and 122.

After the main *Essay* was written, and apparently after it had been set up in type, Atterbury's famous *Letter to a Convocation-Man* (1697) was published.¹ Atterbury based his demand for a church convocation on the urgent need to suppress what he thought a monstrous new growth of heresy, schism, deism, &c. He foresaw the objection that the means for dealing with these evils already existed, but he denied that such was the case. The powers of the bishops and the universities were far too limited; he was ambiguous and evasive about the powers of the crown; on those of Parliament his position, while put with some caution, was clear enough: Parliament had still not acted in the matter, nor in truth was it proper for Parliament to exercise a function which was ecclesiastical in nature and belonged properly to Convocation.²

Tindal read Atterbury's pamphlet in time to delay the appearance of *An Essay* (1697) until he could append to it 'A Postscript in Answer to the Letter to a Convocation-Man' (pp. 176–204), which is obviously hurriedly written, is set in a smaller type than the main body of the book, and generally witnesses that it is indeed a postscript. Its theme is that the clergy cannot have the powers claimed by *A Letter to a Convocation-Man*, and in this context it makes a point, as the main *Essay* had not done, of liberty of the press. Quoting Atterbury's complaint that Parliament had done nothing in defence of religion, it replies:

But what can Men in a Legislative Capacity do more for Religion, than . . . to protect every one in worshipping God as they judg most agreeable to his Will, and give them the best Opportunity of informing themselves of his Mind? And have they not done this, by granting a Toleration, and by refusing a Bill for restraining the Liberty of the Press? (p. 184)

This reference to the Commons' rejection, in April, of Pulteney's Bill to license news helps to explain the nature of the 'Postscript's' argument against licensing. Less than four pages long, this is simply that the power claimed by the clergy belonged elsewhere. Such an argument was obviously a suitable one to oppose to the *Letter to a Convocation-Man*, and the Commons' action in April apparently encouraged Tindal to think that the state would not use the power of licensing; hence the best way to keep it out of the hands of the clergy—who would—was to claim it exclusively for the state. Despite the Reformation, he wrote, the clergy, 'loth to forgo their beloved Empire over the Consciences of Men' (p. 185), remained

¹ William Fraser, who edited the pamphlet in 1853, argued that the author was Sir Bartholomew Shower, and this attribution was long accepted; it is now generally agreed that the pamphlet was written by Atterbury from materials supplied by Shower. See B.M. Catalogue.

² Pp. 8–16.

no less zealous to hinder the Liberty of the Press . . . but the Powers the Clergy claimed to themselves being inconsistent with the Principles of the Reformation, and in *England* with the Oath of Supremacy, and that Power the Laws have invested the King with, there is nothing so contradictory as their pretended Power, and that which they are forced to own does belong to the Magistrate. (p. 186)

Then, after some expansion of this point, Tindal says, 'But of these things more fully in my next Discourse . . .' (p. 187).

But Tindal's 'next Discourse', while certainly a plea for unlicensed printing, is not an argument that the clergy cannot have the power of licensing because it belongs rightfully to the magistrate. Quite the contrary: it argues that the power of licensing in the hands of the magistrate would enable him to impose a secular tyranny as evil as the spiritual tyranny at which a licensing clergy would aim. The position is that while the press must be responsible to the law (i.e. the publisher's name must appear, so that he may be answerable to indictment or suit),¹ licensing is bad, whether used by ecclesiastical or civil authority.

Perhaps the introduction of further licensing Bills in Parliament in late 1697 and early 1698 had lessened Tindal's confidence in the tactic he had adopted against Atterbury,² but the main determinant of the new position was Milton's *Areopagitica*. A few parallel readings will establish *A Letter* (1698)'s dependence upon *Areopagitica*.

A Letter (1698)

Were Licensers unbiast, uncorrupt, and infallible, there might be good Reason to trust them with an Arbitrary Power to pass what Sentences they pleas'd on Books; but if we are to judg of the future by the past, they are almost as likely to be one as the other.

Areopagitica

If learned men be the first receivers out of books, & dispredders both of vice and error, how shall the licensers themselves be confidined, unlesse we can conferr upon them, or they assume to themselves above all others in the Land, the grace of infallibility, and

¹ *A Letter* (1698), p. 18.

² That White was wrong in thinking that Tindal was 'writing in 1698 against Mr. Pulteney's Bill' is obvious to anyone who recalls the date of that Bill, but the error is explicable enough. It is due to Cobbett, who reprinted *A Letter* (1698) as an appendix throwing light on the Commons' conduct in first calling for, and then rejecting, Pulteney's Bill of 1 April 1697: 'About this time a small tract was published, intituled, "A Letter to a Member of Parliament [&c.];" for a copy of which see Appendix No. XIII' (v, col. 1164). Appendix XIII gives its source for the tract, which it dates 1697, as *State Tracts*, but in that collection the date appears correctly as 1698. Evidently Cobbett, unaware of the continuing debate on the subject, assumed that *A Letter* (1698) must have been occasioned by Pulteney's Bill, and that the editors of *State Tracts* had mistaken the date; he accordingly 'corrected' this to fit the parliamentary action. The association with Pulteney's Bill remained in White's mind even though he got the date of *A Letter* (1698) right.

Men of Sense, (and others ought not to be trusted with it) without being resolved to make the most of it, will not care to be condemned to the drudgery of reading all the Trash that comes to be printed, nothing but necessity will make such persons submit to it, and that necessity will make them less able to withstand Temptation. So that the appointing Licensers will be as bad as laying a Tax on Learning. . . . But this is not the worst, it will be a great hindrance to the promoting of Knowledge and Truth, by discouraging the ablest Men from writing, for such Persons, especially after having once had the liberty of publishing their own Thoughts, will not be content to have their Works lie at the Mercy of an ignorant or at the best of an unleisured Licenser, who upon a cursory view may either condemn the whole to perpetual Darkness, or strike out what he pleaseth, perhaps the most material things. And tho a living Author may subject himself to this, yet none will be content that the Labours of a deceased Friend should be so served; so that the Works of such a Person, tho never so famous in his Life-time, shall be lost to all Posterity. Besides, is it not intolerable, that every time a Man has a mind to make any Alteration or Addition between the licensing of the Copy, and the printing it off, that he must as often hunt after the same Licenser to obtain his leave, for the Printer could not go beyond his licensed Copy, when in the mean time the Press, to his no small damage, must stand still?

In short, tho there might seem to be some reason to condemn a Person that upon a fair Trial had been found

uncorruptednesse? (p. 14)¹ He who is made judge to sit upon the birth, or death of books whether they may be wafted into this world, or not, had need to be a man above the common measure, both studious, learned, and judicious. . . . If he be of such worth as behoovs him, there cannot be a more tedious and unpleasing journey-work, a greater losse of time levied upon his head, then to be made the perpetual reader of unchosen books and pamphlets, oftentimes huge volumes . . . an imposition which I cannot beleeve how he that values time, and his own studies, or is but of a sensible nostrill should be able to endure. . . . Seeing therefore . . . that no man of worth . . . is ever likely to succeed them, except he mean to put himself to the salary of a Presse-corrector, we may easily foresee what kind of licensers we are to expect hereafter, either ignorant, imperious, and remisse, or basely pecuniary. . . . I lastly proceed from the no good it can do, to the manifest hurt it causes, in being first the greatest discouragement and affront, that can be offer'd to learning and to learned men. . . . Know, that so far to distrust the judgement & the honesty of one who hath but a common repute in learning, and never yet offended, as not to count him fit to print his mind without a tutor and examiner, lest he should drop a scism, or something of corruption, is the greatest displeasure and indignity to a free and knowing spirit that can be put upon him. . . . If serious and elaborat writings, as if they were no more then the theam of a Grammar lad under his Pedagogue must not be utter'd without the cursory eyes of a temporizing and extemporizing

¹ Page references are to the original edition (1644).

guilty of writing immoral things, or against the Government, to the Punishment of never writing again but under the Authority of an Examiner; yet what reason can there be that those that never offended, nay that the whole Commonwealth of Learning should be subject to so severe Usage, which too is the way to have none but Fools and Blockheads plague the World with their Impertinence, and make an *Imprimatur* (as it did formerly) signify no more than that such a Book is foolish enough to be printed? (pp. 30-32)

licencer. . . . If in this the most consummat act of his fidelity and ripenesse, no years, no industry, no former proof of his abilities can bring him to that state of maturity, as not to be still mistrusted and suspected, unlesse he carry all his considerat diligence, all his midnight watchings, and expence of *Palladian oyl*, to the hasty view of an unleasur'd licencer, perhaps much his younger, perhaps far his inferiour in judgement, perhaps one who never knew the labour of book-writing, and if he be not repulst, or slighted, must appear in Print like a punie with his guardian, and his censors hand on the back of his title to be his bayl and surety, that he is no idiot, or seducer, it cannot be but a dishonor and derogation to the author, to the book, to the priviledge and dignity of Learning. And what if the author shall be one so copious of fancie, as to have many things well worth the adding, come into his mind after licencing, while the book is yet under the Presse, which not seldom happ'ns to the best and diligentest writers; and that perhaps a dozen times in one book. The Printer dares not go beyond his licenc't copy; so often then must the author trudge to his leav-giver, that those his new insertions may be viewd; and many a jaunt will be made, ere that licencer, for it must be the same man, can either be found, or found at leisure; mean while either the Presse must stand still, which is no small damage, or the author loose his accuratest thoughts, & send the book forth wors then he had made it, which to a diligent writer is the greatest melancholy and vexation that can befall. And how can a man teach with autority . . . whenas all he teaches, all he delivers, is but under the tuition, under the correction

of his patriarchal licenser to blot or alter what precisely accords not with the hidebound humor which he calls his judgement. When every acute reader upon the first sight of a pedantic licence, will be ready with these like words to ding the book a coits distance from him, I hate a pupil teacher. . . . This is some common stufte. . . . Nay, which is more lamentable, if the work of any deceased author, though never so famous in his life time, and even to this day, come to their hands for licence to be Printed, or Reprinted, if there be found in his book one sentence of a ventrous edge . . . they will not pardon him their dash: the sense of that great man shall to all posterity be lost, for the fearfulness, or the presumptuous rashnesse of a perfunctory licenser. . . . Had any one writt'n and divulgd erroneous things & scandalous to honest life, . . . if after conviction this only censure were adjudg'd him, that he should never henceforth write, but what were first examin'd by an appointed officer, whose hand should be annexed to passe his credit for him, that now he might be safely read, it could not be apprehended lesse than a disgracefull punishment. Whence to include the whole Nation, and those that never yet thus offended, under such a diffident and suspectfull prohibition, may plainly be understood what a disparagement it is. (pp. 19-23)

And if some good men . . . had not had the Courage privately to print some Treatises to undeceive the People, and to make them see the fatal Consequences of those Doctrines which by the restraint of the Press pass'd for divine and sacred Truths; the Nation had tamely submitted to the yoke. And

There have bin not a few since the beginning of this Parlament . . . who by their unlicenc't books to the contempt of an *Imprimatur* first broke that triple ice clung about our hearts, and taught the people to see day: I hope that none of these were the persuaders to renew upon us this bondage which

as it cannot be denied but that those Papers in a great measure opened our eyes, so it may justly be hoped that none that saw the miserable Condition that the Act for regulating the Press would have brought us into, will be instrumental in reestablishing that Law. No; those Men sure who so much exclaimed against it in the late Reigns, will take all care imaginable to prevent it now. But if these very men who may justly be said to be written into their places, and owe their Preferments to the freedom of examining those slavish Doctrines of the former Reigns; if these Men, I say, can so far forget themselves as to be for a Law which till themselves were uppermost they thought tended only to inslave us, there cannot be, I think, a greater Argument for all others to oppose it. (pp. 26-27)

The Clergy, say they, are so learned, and withal so numerous, that amongst them they could not fail to expose and confound any thing that's writ against them, had they but Truth on their side, which they know is, next to the Almighty, strong, and therefore needs no licensing Tricks, or Stratagems, to make it victorious: These are the mean Shifts that Error is forced to use against its Power. (pp. 16-17)

If we must, *early and late*, according to the Wise Man's direction, *seek after Wisdom as after a hidden Treasure*; I cannot see how it will become the *Wisdom* of a Nation to endeavour by a Law to hinder us from knowing more than the scanty Measure of a Party-Licensor will afford us. (p. 7)

they themselves have wrought so much good by contemning. But if . . . neither their own remembrance what evill hath abounded in the Church by this lett of licencing, and what good they themselves have begun by transgressing it, be not anough, but that they will perswade, and execute the most *Dominican* part of the Inquisition over us, and are already with one foot in the stirrup so active at supressing, it would be no unequall distribution in the first place to suppresse the suppressors themselves; whom the change of their condition hath puffed up, more then their late experience of harder times hath made wise. (p. 39)

Writing is more publick then preaching; and more easie to refutation, if need be, there being so many whose businesse and profession meerly it is, to be the champions of Truth; which if they neglect, what can be imputed but their sloth, or inability? (p. 28) For who knows not that Truth is strong next to the Almighty; she needs no policies, nor stratagems, nor licensings, to make her victorious, those are the shifts and the defences that error uses against her power. . . . (p. 36)

What a collusion is this, whenas we are exhorted by the wise man to use diligence, *to seek for wisdom as for hidd'n treasures* early and late, that another order shall enjoyn us to know nothing but by statute. (p. 36)

I can see no reason why they that are for tying Men to that Interpretation of Scripture a Licencer shall approve, and therefore put it into his power to hinder all others from being published, can with any justice condemn the Popish Clergy for not licensing the Bible it self for the Laity to read it. For if the Bible is to be translated into the vulgar Tongue, to what end is it, but that the People by reading it may judg what is their Duty in the most obscure and difficult places? (p. 16)

Tho I cannot but presume that our Legislators, were there no other reason, yet out of respect to the Clergy, would not enact such a Law as supposeth the greatest and most learned of them not fit to be trusted with the printing but a Half-sheet in Religion without consent of a . . . Licenser. . . . But if they are content with that Disgrace, it must be because either they cannot defend themselves against their Adversaries, or that they have a mind to give themselves up to Laziness and Idleness, and not trouble themselves with the laborious work of controversial Divinity. (pp. 23-24)

But then all human learning and controversie in religious points must remove out of the world, yea the Bible it selfe; for that oftentimes . . . answers dubiously and darkly to the common reader. . . . For these causes we all know the Bible it selfe put by the Papist into the first rank of prohibited books. (p. 13)

This may have much reason to discourage the Ministers when such a low conceit is had of all their exhortations, and the benefiting of their hearers, as that they are not thought fit to be turn'd loose to three sheets of paper without a licenser. . . . (p. 24) But if his rear and flanks be not impal'd, if his back dore be not secur'd by the rigid licenser, but that a bold book may now and then issue forth, and give the assault to some of his old collections in their trenches, it will concern him then to keep waking, to stand in watch, to set good guards and sentinells about his receiv'd opinions. . . . And God send that the fear of this diligence which must then be us'd, doe not make us affect the lazines of a licencing Church. (p. 28)

The argument of *A Letter* (1698) is not precisely that of *Areopagitica*: it is *Areopagitica* adapted to deism. It begins by premising that what distinguishes man from brutes is his reason, 'the only Light God has given him, not only to discover that there is a Religion, but to distinguish the true from the many false ones' (p. 3). Whoever neglects to use his reason to find out for himself the truth of religion is disobedient to God, 'and tho he should light on Truth, the luckiness of the Accident will no way excuse his Disobedience' (p. 4). At the same time, men have a duty to inform others of what they believe to be the truth. Hence the press, the primary means of such communication, ought not to be restrained, because such restraint

'tends to make Men blindly submit to the Religion they chance to be educated in', deprives them of the 'best means to discover Truth, by . . . seeing and examining . . . different Opinions' (p. 5), 'hinders Truth from having any great influence on Mens Minds, which is owing chiefly to Examination', and 'tends to make us hold the Truth (should we chance to light on it) guiltily' (p. 6).

Papery quite rightly adopted licensing as the best means of maintaining its empire over men by keeping them stupid and ignorant, and this policy was successful until the invention of printing made it unenforceable (the success of the Reformation was due to printing); but for a Protestant church to ape Rome in this is to betray its fundamental principles and reveal that it is actuated by ambition rather than by love of truth. Licensing is no cure for heresy or schism; to hold a belief on trust is heresy (even if the belief is true), and schism is caused by the attempt to impose on men's minds. The only cure of heresy and schism is freedom for all opinions, for truth is invincible (pp. 8-24).

With respect to civil rights liberty of the press is equally fundamental. A licensed press must be subservient to the will of a ruler who aspires to arbitrary power, and thus leave the people without warning or guidance; on the other hand, a free press will alert them to attempted encroachments. 'Secure but the Liberty of the Press, and that will, in all probability, secure all other Liberty; but if that once falls into the hands of ill designing Men, nothing that we hold dear or precious is safe' (p. 27).

Here, then, in a pamphlet which everywhere echoes *Areopagitica*, is a sharp change from the author's last discussion of the subject. It seems impossible that Tindal could have known *Areopagitica* when he wrote 'A Postscript', and it is therefore most likely that he first encountered it in one of the collections of 1697 and 1698.¹

¹ One phrase, however, suggests that Tindal may also have made use of Charles Blount's adaptation of *Areopagitica*, *A Just Vindication of Learning* (1679). Where *Areopagitica* has (p. 22): 'When every acute reader upon the first sight of a pedantick licence, will be ready with these like words to ding the book a coits distance from him, I hate a pupil teacher, . . . This is some common stuffe', Blount wrote (p. 7): 'Every Acute Reader upon first sight of a Pedantick License, will be apt to misinterpret the word (*Imprimatur*) and think it signifies no more, but that, thin Book is foolish enough to be Printed.' Here *A Letter* (1698) speaks (pp. 31-32) of the way to 'make an *Imprimatur* (as it did formerly) signify no more than that such a Book is foolish enough to be printed'. Tindal may well have used Blount's pamphlet for help in abbreviating Milton; he could not have relied wholly on it, for he adopts a good deal from *Areopagitica* which is not in Blount.

The discovery that Blount's *A Just Vindication* was an adaptation of *Areopagitica* was made by Macaulay, who also attributed to Blount the 1693 tract entitled *Reasons Humbly Offered for the Liberty of Unlicens'd Printing*; see Book III, chap. 19. Holt White had already noticed (p. cxxi) that the latter tract, whose authorship he did not know, was 'a sort of abridgment of the *Areopagitica*'. Sensabaugh (pp. 55-61 and 155-62) discusses at length the relation of Blount's two pamphlets to *Areopagitica* without referring to either White or Macaulay.

III

The first reply to *A Letter* (1698) was *A Modest Plea For the Due Regulation of the Press, In Answer to several Reasons lately Printed against it* (1698), by the well-known divine Francis Gregory, who had been chaplain to Charles II and was now rector of Hambledon. Although Gregory begins *ad hominem*, deducing that the author of *A Letter* (1698) must be 'one of the worst sort of Hereticks, I mean a Socinian' (p. 3), his tract is for the most part studiedly moderate in tone. His method is to take up in turn each of Tindal's propositions, usually conceding the principle but denying the application. Thus, for example, he concedes that to take up a religion on trust is sinful, and that unhappily many Englishmen calling themselves Protestants have done so; but it is false to blame this condition on licensing of the press: it was a ground of complaint in the days of the apostles, long before the invention of printing, and is due to faults of human nature. Men ought indeed to examine their beliefs, but in England licensing has been no hindrance thereto, since Scripture and orthodox expositors of Scripture are freely published. Only erroneous and heretical commentators, apt to mislead and seduce, are suppressed (pp. 11-13). In this manner Gregory runs through *A Letter* (1698) from the viewpoint of the established church, his own position being that 'since this unlimited Liberty of the Press would certainly be . . . an in-let to Schisms, Heresies, and a great variety of Opinions and Practices in Matters of Religion; the allowance of it can never consist with that Command of God, contend earnestly for the Faith once delivered to the Saints' (p. 41).

The second reply to *A Letter* (1698) was anonymous. *A Letter to a Member of Parliament, Shewing the Necessity of Regulating the Press: . . . With A Particular Answer to the Objections that of late have been Advanced against it* (Oxford, 1699), which is not in Halkett and Laing, is attributed by Wing (D837) to Defoe—an attribution which, if correct, would make this the most surprising product of even that prodigal pen (actually, Defoe took the opposite side in this controversy, as will appear below). Sensabaugh, noticing this pamphlet because it refers to Milton by name, is unaware of the controversy to which it belongs and dismisses it in a half-sentence as by some 'loyal old Anglican' (p. 196)—an attribution which, while not very informative, is at least more likely to be correct than Wing's.

A Letter Shewing the Necessity is more uncompromising than Gregory's *Modest Plea*. It argues the case for licensing from basic principles: the duty of the magistrate in matters of religion, considered first in a state of nature and then in a state of Revelation (pp. 1-15); the necessity of an established church (pp. 15-26); the magistrate's obligation to maintain the true and established church against attacks from misbelievers and

unbelievers, and hence his duty to control the press, for which no means short of licensing can be effectual (pp. 26–47). Most of the rest of the tract is devoted to answering the chief arguments of *A Letter* (1698), which it does not name but from which it quotes and paraphrases extensively (pp. 48–62). The author ends by urging the Member of Parliament to whom his *Letter* is at least ostensibly addressed to use his influence in the House to bring forward a new licensing Bill. The failure of the Bill in the last Parliament ‘cannot conclude against the Reasonableness or Necessity of it. I’m confident the Eyes and Heart, the Hopes and Expectations of every Englishman, that is acted with a true Concern for the True Religion, are fixed on the ensuing Session’ (p. 63).

Since in fact neither the ensuing session nor the one following produced a new licensing Bill, Tindal seems to have troubled himself with no other reply to his two assailants than the republication of his original *A Letter* (1698) in 1700.¹ But in 1702 bills were introduced in both Houses, although neither successfully; in March of 1703 a royal proclamation announced a more rigorous enforcement of existing unrepealed press laws; in December the Commons gave leave for another Bill, and by 18 January 1704 this had passed a second reading.² Tindal was sufficiently alarmed to publish *Reasons Against Restraining the Press* (1704). (It was during the same crisis that Defoe composed his plea against licensing, *An Essay on the Regulation of the Press*).³

Reasons (1704) is a systematic abridgement of *A Letter* (1698), but since it is only one-third the length of the original most of the latter’s verbal echoes of *Areopagitica* have been squeezed out. A few remain; e.g. ‘Nothing can more discourage men of Abilities from writing, than to subject their Discourse to the mercy of an Ignorant, or at least an Unleisured Licenser: such a Hardship on the Commonwealth of Learning, will be apt to make an *Imprimatur* signify no more, than that the Book is foolish enough to be printed’ (pp. 9–10). But the influence of *Areopagitica* on *Reasons* (1704) is primarily in the structure of ideas, and this is fully visible only through *A Letter* (1698).

The failure of the Bill of 1704 did not end the effort to reimpose licensing and other forms of press censorship, and Tindal continued to fight for freedom of the press; but as his position became increasingly complicated by immediate concerns (e.g. the defence of two men imprisoned for selling one of his books)⁴ his argument gave less visible evidence of the influence

¹ *Term Catalogues*, iii. 188; Wing (L1681) shows a copy in the National Library of Scotland; there is no copy in the B.M.

² In the event Parliament was prorogued without its reaching a third reading; see Hanson, pp. 9–10.

³ Ed. J. R. Moore for the Luttrell Society (Oxford, 1948).
⁴ *A Second Defence of the Rights of the Christian Church, Occasion'd by two late Indictments against a Bookseller and his Servant, for selling one of the said Books* (London, 1708.)

of *Areopagitica*. That influence was not spent; on the contrary, those of its aspects which Tindal found congenial were so thoroughly absorbed that they became part of his own attitude, and no longer needed to be clothed in Milton's language when they appeared in Tindal's writings. They had done their work, converting one who would have tried to withhold the power of licensing from the clergy by vesting it in the state into the protagonist of an unlicensed press as the basic guarantee of all liberties.

IV

In 1738, when it was thought that the revival of stage licensing might well be followed by an attempt to revive licensing of the press, James Thomson, the poet, edited, with a preface, the first separate republication of *Areopagitica*.¹ It has been thought that *Areopagitica* was thus rescued from a century of virtual oblivion and launched into a second career of almost universal influence. But in fact it seems likely that despite the absence of acknowledgement *Areopagitica* had exerted something like a continuous influence throughout its first century. We have long known that it played a part in the lapse of the Press Act in 1679 and in the attempt, in 1693, to prevent one of the Act's recurrent renewals.² We may now add a considerable influence in the decade from 1698 to 1707. There is some reason to think that it had more influence immediately after publication than has recently been thought.³ Perhaps there were other cases of unacknowledged use, and some to fill the apparent gap between 1707 and 1738?

¹ *Areopagitica: A Speech of Mr. John Milton. . . . First Published in the Year 1644. With a Preface, by another Hand.* London: Printed for A. Millar. 1738.

² See White, Macaulay, and Sensabaugh, as cited above, p. 271, n. 1.

³ See *Complete Prose Works of John Milton*, ii, ed. E. Sirluck (New Haven, 1959), pp. 87, 89, 90, 91, 209, 506-7, 545-6, 551.

T
Nor
as a
boun
of E
Nors
acco
linus
medie
nicae
copie
compa
his i
unac
Rhys
Rhyn
tiona
Davi
many
the s
of th
Gwa
trans

¹ 1738
'was g
dence

² F

English

³ e.

■ an

l'œuvre

Scholo

⁴ Ja

hanede

⁵ T

Evan

Evans

R.E.S

GRAY'S 'THE TRIUMPHS OF OWEN'

By ARTHUR JOHNSTON

THE *Triumphs of Owen*' was first published in Dodsley's edition of Gray's poems in 1768. Together with the translations from Old Norse, it supplied the place of 'The Long Story'.¹ Gray had intended it as a 'specimen of the style that reigned in ancient times among the neighbouring nations', to be included in the introduction to his projected history of English poetry, for which he had also made the translations from Old Norse. For these he had used the texts of the originals, which were accompanied by Latin glosses, in Torfaeus's *Historia Orcadum* and Bartolinus's *Antiquitatum Danicorum de Causis contemptae Mortis*.² Texts of medieval Welsh poems were to be found in J. D. Rhys's *Cambrobrytanicae Cymraecae linguae institutiones* (1592) and some of these Gray copied into his Commonplace Book.³ Probably about the same time he compiled the section on Welsh prosody in his article 'Cambri', drawing his information from the very full account in Rhys. Even though 'entirely unacquainted with the Language', wrote Gray, 'one may perceive' from Rhys's examples, 'something of the Measure, Alliteration, and Order of Rhymes' in early Welsh poetry.⁴ But without an adequate Welsh dictionary it was impossible to understand the meaning. Gray used John Davies's *Antiqueae linguae Britannicae dictionarium* (1632), but would find many of the words not glossed.⁵ It is interesting, therefore, to find that in the summer of 1758 Gray received, via Daines Barrington, Latin versions of three Welsh poems, one of which, 'Arwyrein Owen Gwynedd' by Gwalchmai ap Meilyr, is the original of 'The Triumphs of Owen'. The translations were by the Welsh scholar Evan Evans and were 'as literal as

¹ 'The Long Story' was omitted as 'its only use', that of explaining Bentley's designs, 'was gone'. (Gray to Walpole, 25 Feb. 1768, in P. Toynbee and L. Whibley, *Correspondence of Thomas Gray* (Oxford, 1935), iii. 1017.)

² For a discussion of Gray's translations from Old Norse see D. C. Tovey, *Gray's English Poems* (Cambridge, 1898), pp. 237-57.

³ e.g. Taliesin's *Dyhyddiant Elphin* ('Elphin's Consolations') from Rhys, pp. 182-3, as an example of Welsh heptasyllabic verse; see R. Martin, *Chronologie de la vie et de l'œuvre de Thomas Gray* (Toulouse, 1931), p. 173. See also W. P. Jones, *Thomas Gray, Scholar* (Cambridge, Mass., 1937), pp. 90-99.

⁴ Jones, p. 91. Rhys, pp. 156 ff., gives detailed accounts of Welsh metres and *cymghanedd*.

⁵ This is the complaint of the finest Welsh scholar of the mid-eighteenth century, Evan Evans, in his letters to Thomas Percy: *The Correspondence of Thomas Percy and Evan Evans*, ed. A. Lewis (Baton Rouge, 1958).

[those] wherewith the Greek poets are commonly rendered into Latin'.¹ Evans sent his literal gloss of Gwalchmai's ode to more than one correspondent later, the most important recipient being Thomas Percy in August 1761. The copy sent to Percy has survived² so that we may now examine the text from which 'The Triumphs of Owen' was composed. The usual assumption of Gray's editors has been that Gray used Evans's English prose version as printed in his *Some Specimens of the Poetry of the Ancient Welsh Bards* (1764).³ With the Latin gloss before him since 1758, it is hardly likely that Gray would require the English version of six years later. His interest in the projected history of English poetry was at its height between 1758 and 1761, and by the latter date he had probably made his illustrative translations.⁴ Gray's other translations from the Welsh, published by Mason, are from Evans's Latin *Dissertatio de Bardis*, which Gray saw in June 1760⁵ and from which he selected three passages from the *Gododdin*.

The occasion of Gwalchmai's ode to Owen Gwynedd is not completely certain. In all probability it celebrates the victory of Owen, Prince of North Wales from 1137 to 1170, over three fleets sent against him as part of the expedition of Henry II in 1157. Gwalchmai's poem locates the battle at Tal y Moelfre on the north-east coast of Anglesey.⁶

Gray 'approved of this ode very much', Evans told Percy; what he admired in it we cannot now discover. But two of Gray's contemporaries—the Welsh poet Goronwy Owen and Thomas Percy—have left their opinions

¹ See *Letters of Lewis, Richard, William and John Morris*, 1728–65, ed. J. H. Davies (Aberystwyth, 1906–9), ii. 86. In all probability Evans sent the Welsh texts also, as he did in August 1761 to Percy. See *Percy–Evans Correspondence*, p. 6.

² B.M. Add. MS. 32330. Printed in *Percy–Evans Correspondence*, pp. 191–2; and in *Shenstone's Miscellany 1759–1763*, ed. I. A. Gordon (Oxford, 1952), p. 111.

³ For example in the editions of Gray's poems by Mitford and Tovey, and in Toynbee and Whibley, iii. 1230 n., and R. W. Ketton-Cremer, *Thomas Gray* (Cambridge, 1955), p. 179.

⁴ It is usually accepted that the translations were made before 1761; see Toynbee and Whibley, iii. 1230–1. Evans's English version was made after October 1761, since it is a slightly revised version of the translation made by Rice Williams and sent to Evans on 28 Oct. 1761 (*Percy–Evans Correspondence*, pp. 164–6). It was Percy who persuaded Evans to publish English instead of Latin versions.

⁵ Toynbee and Whibley, ii. 680, iii. 1229–31; *Percy–Evans Correspondence*, p. 8 n.

⁶ See J. E. Lloyd, *A History of Wales* (London, 1948), ii. 498–9. A number of knights landed and plundered the area but were heavily defeated by the islanders on returning to their ships. Gwalchmai's hyperbole, 'And Menai ebbed not for flood of the blood that flowed' creates a difficulty, since Menai is the strait separating Anglesey from the mainland, in the south, and so at a great distance from Moelfre. In the Welsh chronicle 'Brut y Saeson' in MS. Cotton Cleopatra B v, the landing-place is said to be Menai. It is unlikely that Owen himself should have happened to be at Moelfre or Menai when the raid was made, since his army was at the time near Basingwerk, where Henry II was heavily defeated, Henry himself barely escaping with his life.

in some detail. Owen admired Gwalchmai's avoidance of 'too minute a detail of matter of fact':

Gwalchmai gives you no definite number of any thing, but only of the three fleets which came combined for the ruin of one principality, he does not tell you who killed who, or how many were killed of the enemy, but you may guess at the slaughter of that day by the ebb-tide not being discoverable at Menai, the ebbing of the water being supplied by a torrent of blood. Tho it is an hyperbole, yet it is a sublime and beautiful one. . . .¹

Evans copied Owen's criticism and sent it on 8 August 1761 to Percy, with the Welsh and Latin texts of the ode.² The letter accompanying these was taken by Percy to Cambridge and lent to Gray, who copied from it a passage from Sir John Wynne's manuscript account of the Gwadir family relating to Edward I's supposed massacre of the Welsh Bards.³ The conversation at the meeting between Gray and Percy on 3 September 1761 ranged over many aspects of early poetry—Ossian, Percy's Folio manuscript, 'Sir Thopas' and the romances, and Evans and Welsh poetry.⁴ Percy's notes of the conversation are not now extant,⁵ but it is likely that Gwalchmai's ode, which was appended to the letter lent to Gray, and mentioned in it, was discussed. On his return from Cambridge Percy wrote to Evans on 15 October 1761, informing him of the meeting with Gray, and answering Owen's critique of the ode. He pointed out that it was

the essence of *Ode* to neglect *Circumstance*: Being more confined in its plan [than epic] and having the sublime equally for its object; in order to attain this it is obliged to deal in general terms, to give only such hints, as will forcibly strike the imagination and from which we may infer the particulars ourselves . . . the Hints he drops, and the Images he throws out, supply the absence of more minute detail, and excite as grand Ideas, as the best description could have done.

His opinion of this ode is enthusiastic:

It contains a large portion of the sublime. The images are very bold and animated: and poured forth with such rapidity, as argues an uncommon warmth of imagination in the bard. Whose mind seems to have been so filled with his subject, and the several scenes of the War appear to have so crowded in upon him,

¹ Owen to William Morris, 21 May 1754: *The Letters of Goronwy Owen*, ed. J. H. Davies (Cardiff, 1924), pp. 110–13.

² *Percy–Evans Correspondence*, pp. 6, 191–3.

³ *Ibid.*, pp. 11, 14–15.

⁴ Toynbee and Whibley, iii. 1232; *The Correspondence of Thomas Percy and Richard Farmer*, ed. Cleanth Brooks (Baton Rouge, 1946), p. 8.

⁵ Percy made his notes in October 1761; see B.M. Add. MS. 32329, f. 3. If Gray had translated Gwalchmai's ode by September 1761 he does not appear to have told Percy that he had. It is possible that Percy's comments on the ode, in his letter to Evans, reproduce the substance of his conversation with Gray on this topic.

that he has not leisure to mark the transitions, with that cool accuracy which a feebler Genius would have been careful to have done. It is one continued fiery torrent of poetic flame.¹

The Latin gloss on which he based this opinion was the same as that used by Gray when composing 'The Triumphs of Owen'. A comparison of Gray's poem with this text will throw some light on Gray's methods of translation and on the degree of success he achieved.

Carmen encomiasticum in Owenum Venedotiae principem, auctore Gwalchmai, qui floruit aº 1100.

Laudabo munificum [virum], ex stirpe Roderici,
defensorem patriae, dominum bonae indolis,
Britanniae decus, agilem armisque expeditum Owenum,
Rex qui nec recondit, nec cumulat nummos.

- 5 Tres classes venerunt, fluctus navigia,
tres validaes primi ordinis classes ut eum subito aggredierentur,
una ex Hibernica; altera armatis instructa
Lochliniensibus [Danis] in undis longam seriem exhibens.
tertia trans mare venit ex Normannia,
10 cui fuit labor ingens et immanis.

Et Draconis Monae proles [i.e. Oweni filii] adeo in conflictu magnanima
ut ibi fuerit magnus tumultus in eis impetuose adoriendis:
et ante eum, uti omnibus constat, fuerunt confusio gravis,
strages, pugna et mors honesta,
15 et bellum bellum cruentum, et tremor tremor lamentabilis,
[et circa] Tal y Moelfre mille vexilla;
et caedes caedes ardens, hastarumque furor
et festina festina cum indignatione fuga, et in undis demersio
et Menai absque refluxu ob sanguinis torrentem
20 et color virorum sanguinum in salsugine,
et lorica splendens, et vulneris dolor angens,
et mutilati [homines] prostrati ante principem rubra hasta conspicuum,
et Loegriae [i.e. Angliae] commotio et cum ea dimicatio
et ejus in perplexitatem protrusio:
25 et exoriens gloria gladii victoriam reportantis
in linguis [i.e. gentibus] centum et quadraginta ad eum pro merito debite
laudandum.²

¹ *Percy-Evans Correspondence*, pp. 13-14.

² B.M. Add. MS. 32330, ff. 18-19; printed in *Percy-Evans Correspondence*, pp. 191-2. It was also copied by Shenstone into his manuscript miscellany of poems, ed. Gordon, pp. 111, 158-9. 'Et circa' is Evans's addition, to which he adds the note 'Haec pugna navalis commissa fuit iuxta Tal y Moelfre in aestuario Menai iuxta Monam insulam'. The Welsh text is in Evans's *Some Specimens* (London, 1764), pp. 127-8; in *The Poetry of the Gogynfeirdd*, ed. E. Anwyl (Denbigh, 1909); and in *Llawysgrif Hendregadredd*, ed. R. Morris-Jones and others (Cardiff, 1938). Evans's English version is available in editions of Gray's poems by Mason, Stephen Jones, Tovey. Evans's Latin and English

This is Evans's literal gloss of the Welsh text which produced so much excitement in Percy. The many ellipses and the lack of connexions make it difficult to translate—as Percy's friend Rice Williams found. From it Gray could obtain not only the bare meaning of the Welsh, but some of the characteristic features of the original—the boldness of hyperbole in lines 19–20 and 25–27; the use of repetition in lines 15, 17, and 18; the compactness of the syntax; the line-by-line movement; the reliance on lists of general terms in lines 13–22 (*strages, pugna et mors honesta*); the absence of any detailed description of the battle itself; and the general structure of the poem—four lines of general praise of Owen as an ideal prince; six lines describing the three fleets; twelve lines creating an impression of confused conflict; two lines making clear the defeat of the English; and two lines in praise of Owen. If Gray received a copy of the Welsh text, he would also have been able to discover 'something of the Measure, Alliteration, and Order of Rhymes' of his original. The metre of the Welsh is basically that of lines of nine syllables forming couplets rhyming in '-i', for example,

Arddwyreaf hael o hil Rodri,
Ardwyad gorwlad, gwerlin teithi. (1–2)

This type of couplet is called *cyhydded nawban* and is used in couplets 1, 3, 5, 7, 9, 11, 12, 13. Couplets 2, 4, and 8 are *cyhydded hir*, that is, 'metrical double lines of nineteen syllables, having four parts of 5, 5, 5, 4 syllables, the first three rhyming together and the fourth supporting the chief rhyme',¹ in this case '-i'. For example,

Teithiawg Prydain, twyth arfdwyth Owain,
Teyrnain ni grain, ni grawn rei. (3–4)

Two couplets, 6 and 9, are *toddaid*, that is metrical double lines of nineteen syllables, divided into ten and nine. The main rhyme of the poem occurs two or three syllables from the end of the first line, which itself rhymes with the middle of the second line, for example,

A dreig Mon mor ddrud i eissillyd yn aer,
A bu terfysc taer i haer holi. (11–12)

versions are not considered accurate by modern scholars; e.g. he translates 'Teyrnain ni grain, ni grawn rei' as 'Rex qui nec recondit, nec cumulat nummos', and accepts as a suitable translation of this Rice Williams's 'a prince that neither hoardeth nor coveteth riches'. It means 'a prince who does not prostrate himself (before his enemies) and who does not hoard riches'. For a modern literal translation see K. H. Jackson, *A Celtic Miscellany* (London, 1951), p. 254.

¹ *Geiriadur Prifysgol Cymru. A Dictionary of the Welsh Language*. Rhan XII (Cardiff, 1957), s.v. *cyhydded*. Welsh metrical terms are explained in Gwynn Williams, *Introduction to Welsh Poetry* (London, 1953). For help with the meaning and metre of the Welsh text I am grateful to Mrs. M. Surridge.

To this metrical pattern is added the elaborate system of alliteration which binds each line and produces a particular musical effect. Gray attempts to reproduce some of the effect of his original by the use of one or more alliterating letters in each line. For his metre he chose the heptasyllabic couplet, influenced probably by the knowledge that it was a common Welsh metre.¹ The trochaic rhythm with its incantatory effect and speed of movement, together with the strong break which comes between the rhyme word and the accented opening of each line, reproduces part of the characteristic line-by-line movement of the Welsh. Gray's original² is a blend of ornate prosody and wildness of subject, hyperbolical and 'primitive', intentionally obscure in syntax and archaic in vocabulary, creating a pattern of imitative sound, as in the account of the confused fighting:

A'r gad gad greudde, a'r gryd gryd graendde,
Ac am dal Moelfre mil fannieri,
A'r ladd ladd lachar, ar bar beri,
A ffwyr ffwyr ffyrfgawdd ar fawdd foddi. (15-18)

There is little that is pictorial in the Welsh, no simile or metaphor. Gray's translation is a series of vivid pictures, his language figurative. His first eight lines represent the title and lines 1 to 4 of the Welsh and Latin, and while they capture the meaning, as the Latin represents it, do so with some rearrangement, some interpretation, and much decoration. In order to achieve a 'true Lyric style, with all its flights of fancy, ornaments & heightening of expression, & harmony of sound'³ Gray substitutes specific images for general terms—'defensorem' becomes 'shield', 'decus' becomes 'gem', 'ex stirpe Roderici' becomes 'Fairest flower of Roderic's stem', both ornamenting and heightening the style, and supplying the figurativeness of language that was expected of 'primitive' poetry. In rearranging

¹ Gray used a trochaic seven-syllable line, rhyming alternately, for 'The Fatal Sisters' and in couplets for 'Conan', 'Caradoc', and parts of 'The Death of Hoel'. The seven-syllable couplet had been pilloried by Pope as the 'Infantine Style', as it was used by Ambrose Phillips. Gray is clearly conscious, in 'The Fatal Sisters', of the couplet as used in the Witches' speeches in *Macbeth*, and probably of Dryden's imitation of these in *Oedipus*. Gray wrote to Mason in January 1759 that he had not read *Oedipus* since he was a boy, but that 'it left an impression on [his] fancy'.

² Writing of the poetry of the *Gogynfeirdd* (i.e. 'rather early poets') of whom Gwalchmai was one, Dr. Thomas Parry comments, 'The language of the *Gogynfeirdd* was old in their own day' and quotes the author of *The Dream of Rhonabwy* (mid-thirteenth century) speaking of poets who were eulogizing Arthur: 'there was no man that comprehended that song save Cadriaith himself, except only that it was a song of praise to Arthur' (*A History of Welsh Literature* (tr. H. I. Bell) (Oxford, 1955), p. 47). 'The language employed is often terse . . . and the vocabulary abounds in archaisms' (Anwyl, *Poetry of the Gogynfeirdd*, p. 11); cf. H. I. Bell, *The Development of Welsh Poetry* (Oxford, 1936), p. 43. Parry (p. 48) stresses the important fact that in medieval Welsh poetry sound is as important as sense.

³ Gray to Mason, January 1759, in Toynbee and Whibley, ii. 608.

the material of his original Gray moves towards greater clarity.¹ The Latin title, 'Carmen encomiasticum in Owenum' and the first word of the text, 'Laudabo', suggest Gray's 'Owen's praise demands my song'.² The lines

Lord of every regal art,
Liberal hand and open heart

have the merest suggestion in 'munificum' and 'dominum bonae indolis', and are placed at the climax of the general praise of Owen, as a summing up of the qualities of the ideal prince. They are a more forceful ending than the fourth line in the Latin, 'Rex qui nec recondit, nec cumulat nummos', from which Gray keeps the 'nor . . . nor' construction, but which he interprets in his own way. 'Nor heaps his brooded stores' captures the meaning of 'recondit'. But Gray can hardly have had Evans's English version 'neither hoardeth nor coveteth riches' before him when he wrote 'Nor on all profusely pours'. This would seem to be an interpretation of 'cumulat' that implies the omission of 'in omnes', an interpretation that Gray seems to have considered permissible with a gloss that clearly required some expansion. Gray's view of Owen's liberality is based on Aristotle's definition of the liberal man as one who 'will give for the sake of the noble, and rightly; for he will give to the right people, the right amounts, and at the right time'.³

The second section of the poem, the description of the three fleets, Gray transforms from bare statement to vivid picture, expanding from six lines to ten. He omits the phrases 'ut eum subito aggrederentur' and 'cui fuit labor ingens et immanis', but adds the picturesque detail

Black and huge along they sweep,
Burthens of the angry deep.

He embellishes his bare original with phrases culled from the repertory of poetic diction. 'Proudly riding' he had already used in *The Bard* (l. 72). Dryden's phrase 'And on her shadow rides' (*Annus Mirabilis*, st. 151) may have suggested this, and also Gray's next line, 'On her shadow long and gay', which is his equivalent for 'in undis longam seriam exhibens'. 'Plows the watry way' occurs in the catalogue of ships in Pope's translation of the *Iliad*, II. 685, 'In fourscore barks they plough the watery way'. 'Catch the winds' recalls Pope's 'catch the driving gale' (*Essay on Man*,

¹ Parry (p. 47) writes: 'The one thing they [i.e. the "rather early poets"] did not do was to tell a story, and it was not at making the story clear and intelligible that they aimed.'

² For the form, cf. Isaac Watts, 'True Courage' (*Horae Lyricae* (London, 1709), Book ii) which begins 'Honour demands my song'.

³ *Nichomachean Ethics*, tr. W. D. Ross (Oxford, 1915), IV. i. 1120a, 24-27. To give to all regardless of merit is prodigality, not liberality; Gray's Owen is liberal, that is he steers between the extremes of miserliness and prodigality.

III. 178) or Dryden's 'and all their Sails | Let fall, to court the Wind, and catch the Gales'.¹ This section of Gray's poem is an ornate rendering of the Latin, embellishing the simplicity of the original; as Goldsmith wrote of Pope's Homer, 'if this be a deviation, it is at the same time an improvement'.

For the sake of clarity, and in order to accentuate the situation described in the poem, Gray goes on to his most violent rearrangement of material. His account of the fleets is followed by a brief description of Owen, made up from phrases scattered throughout the rest of the Latin version. 'Dauntless on his native sands' Gray adds for dramatic effect; 'The Dragon-Son of Mona' is his version of 'Draconis Monae proles' (for which Evans's translation is 'the sons of the Dragon of Mona'); 'glittering arms'² and 'glory' would seem to represent 'lorica splendens' and 'exoriens gloria', while 'ruby crest' was perhaps suggested by 'rubra hasta conspicuum'. By means of this four-line description of Owen interpolated here Gray creates a clearer picture of the setting of the battle, and brings into the context of the poem the sympathy with Owen as defender of his territory against massive invasion which Gwalchmai, writing for Owen's court, could take for granted. In extracting this description, Gray has prepared the way for the battle scene, by providing a centre from which to describe it—before and around Owen the confusion rages. The descriptive lines, linked by 'and' in the original, cannot be simply translated into English; as Rice Williams discovered when translating Evans's Latin into English prose, the scene of the battle appears to shift.³ Gray's 'There' is at least clear—somewhere around Owen's standard.

In the Welsh the battle scene is not described, but conveyed in a rapid series of images that, coupled with the imitative sounds in the Welsh, create the impression of confused and violent conflict. There is no necessary order in the variations on a single theme—'magnus tumultus', 'confusio gravis', 'strages, pugna et mors honesta'. Gray reconstitutes the elements of his original in order to convey the same sort of general yet sublime impression as Gwalchmai, but with a stronger syntax.

There the thund'ring strokes begin,
There the press, and there the din,
Talymalhra's rocky shore
Echoing to the battle's roar

¹ *Ceyx and Alcione*, l. 94. The phrase 'catch the wind' is found earlier in prose: '... the schoolmen ... would have taught a ship to catch the wind ... though it had been contrary.' Clarendon, *Essays* (London, 1670) in *Collection of Several Tracts of the Earl of Clarendon* (London, 1727), p. 183.

² A phrase common in Dryden's version of the *Aeneid*, II. 640; VI. 312; XI. 132; and *Knight's Tale*, III. 450.

³ Rice Williams to Evans, 28 Oct. 1761 (*Percy-Evans Correspondence*, p. 164).

corresponds to little specific in the original. Gray has indicated the scene of the conflict by the addition of the gloss 'rocky shore' to Talymalhra, and used his own terms—'the thund'ring strokes', 'the battle's roar'—for a general impression of the conflict, which is given onomatopoeic effect by the thrusting accentuation of 'There'. He invents appropriate movements for Owen—'Where his glowing eye-balls turn', 'Where he points his purple spear', and the 'mil fannieri' (*mille vexilla*) metaphorically 'burn'.

For the last seven lines of his unfinished version Gray uses personifications as a means of translating Gwalchmai's abstractions into figures swiftly visualized by an eighteenth-century reader.¹ Part of his problem was to re-create the animation and 'fire' of his original, while varying his method of heightening the expression and ornamenting his style. The elements for nearly all his personifications are present in the Latin—'Hasty, hasty rout' corresponds to 'festina festina . . . fuga'; 'with indignant eye' to 'cum indignatione'; 'confusion, terror's child' to 'confusio gravis . . . tremor tremor lamentabilis'; 'conflict fierce' to 'magnus tumultus . . . strages'; 'Agony that pants for breath' to 'dolor angens'; 'honourable Death' to 'mors honesta'. Gray has absorbed the significant words in the Latin and, despairing of reproducing the particular order of his original, introduced in a new combination as many as possible of the phrases that suggested themselves as parallels in English. The use of personification was a recognized means of heightening the style and in particular of producing sublimity. Gray's figures are what Addison termed 'Poetical Phrases', 'just shown without being engaged in any Series of Action'.² They achieve conciseness, suggesting the battle 'only by its Adjuncts and Effects' and by the force of suggestion—impelling 'the imagination to build upon the merest hints'—achieve sublimity.³ The force of their appeal was explained by Joseph Trapp: 'the Mind of Man does not love to have too minute a Detail of Particulars; but takes a Pleasure in having Room for Imagination, and in forming a Judgment of what is not express'd from what is'.

This train of argument was used by Percy to justify the use by Gwalchmai of the hyperbole in lines 19–20, which Gray translated

Checked by the torrent-tide of blood,
Backward Menai rolls his flood.

¹ Gray substitutes for Gwalchmai's 'musical' account of the battle a 'pictorial' account, but his 'picture' is allegorical, it represents a battle by portraying figures representing 'Ruin', 'Agony', 'Despair and honourable Death' in characteristic poses. Gray turns his reader into spectator, as Joseph Warton recommended, but it is a spectator of an idealized painting, not of an actual individual battle. For a discussion of literary pictorialism see Jean H. Hagstrum, *The Sister Arts* (Chicago, 1958).

² *Spectator*, 357.

³ Joseph Trapp, *Lectures on Poetry* (1742), pp. 131–2. For a discussion of personification see C. F. Chapin, *Personification in Eighteenth Century English Poetry* (New York, 1955), pp. 10, 15.

This couplet, together with the one following,

While heaped his master's feet around,
Prostrate warriors gnaw the ground¹

was not printed by Gray in 1768, but both were supplied from the manuscript by Mason in his edition. The second couplet was suggested by the phrase 'et mutilati prostrati ante principem' in line 22 of the original. Mason placed these four lines after line 26 of Gray's poem. It is possible that Gray intended them to come after 'Despair and honourable Death', that is, in the place that the equivalent Latin lines have in his original. Their omission from the text published by Gray in 1768 suggests either that he had already written them for the point at which Mason later printed them, but rejected them as unsatisfactory for some reason; or that they were not written until after 1768, that is, in the process of translating the poem he had not yet reached the corresponding Latin lines until after he had printed the preceding portion. Though it would be of interest to discover whether Gray continued to work on his translation after 1768, of greater interest is the fact that Gray offered an unfinished poem to Dodsley—and one that required so few lines to complete the sense of the original. Gray had too great a respect for his craft, and found composing too difficult, for him to add the sort of conclusion that Mason was adept at supplying. It is difficult to believe that Gray deliberately published it unfinished, relying on its appeal as 'A Fragment' of ancient poetry. He may, like Rice William's learned friend, have found the last two lines in the Latin 'too imperfect for him fully to understand'.² More probably the appropriate ending eluded him. All Gray's completed poems end memorably; your last line, he advised Mason, 'ought to sparkle, or at least to shine . . . twirl it a little into an apophegm [sic], stick a flower in it, gild it with a costly expression, let it strike the fancy, the ear, or the heart'.³ Whatever Gray's motive for publishing an unfinished poem, he was right to value his version. There have been few translations of medieval Welsh poems that have so successfully captured the spirit of the original. Gray's own conciseness, elaborate artificiality in diction and syntax, and concern for the musical quality of his verse,⁴ are qualities he shares with Gwalchmai, and

¹ Cf. Dryden, *Aeneid*, xi. 647: 'and dying gnawed the ground'; Dryden, *Of the Pythagorean Philosophy*, l. 31: 'Where Aesaris rolls down his rapid Flood'; Pope, *Iliad*, xx. 91: 'The sacred Flood that rolls on golden sands'; Isaac Watts, *The Celebrated Victory*, ll. 175-9: 'His wild eye-balls roll: his teeth Gnashing with anguish . . . they round their lord Lay prostrate.'

² *Percy-Evans Correspondence*, p. 165.

³ Gray to Mason, 24 Mar. 1758, in Toynbee and Whibley, ii. 568.

⁴ The poetry itself is sufficient evidence of Gray's concern for these qualities, though the letters also show his conscious interest, e.g. ii. 504: 'I cannot give up *lost*, for it begins with an L'; ii. 551: 'extreme conciseness of expression, yet pure, perspicuous, & musical, is one of the grand beauties of lyric poetry. this I have always aim'd at, & never could attain'.

fit him for translating the poem. His success fostered the steady growth of interest in medieval Welsh literature. What Evan Evans was to Gray, William Owen and Edward Williams were, in the next generation, to Southey, Scott, Coleridge, and Blake.¹ At least one Welsh scholar has believed that 'the modern romantic school of poetry in England' had its origin in Gray's odes, 'his noblest lyric effusions', and that the spirit of these was 'caught . . . from the remains of Gwalchmai' as translated into Latin by Evan Evans.² The ode of Gwalchmai was, however, the work that completed, and not the one that began, his study of Welsh poetry. It has been little noticed by critics or editors. Yet it exhibits Gray's meticulous care and fastidious integrity as well as any of his poems.

¹ For the interest of the romantic poets in Welsh literature, see my article 'William Owen-Pughe and the *Mabinogion*', *National Library of Wales Journal*, x (1958), 323-8. Southey uses much Welsh material in *Madoc*, including this ode of Gwalchmai, but has no knowledge of Welsh prosody to enable him to distinguish the material stylistically.

² Thomas Price, 'Carnhuanawc' (1788-1848), in *Cambrian Quarterly Magazine and Celtic Repository* (Jan. 1830), ii. 2, 48-49.

MEREDITH'S PERIANDER

By J. M. S. TOMPKINS

MEREDITH'S *Ballads and Poems of Tragic Life* seem never to have received much critical attention since they appeared in the spring of 1887. The poet's own satisfaction with *The Nuptials of Attila* ensures that that poem shall be mentioned in biographies, and the narrative conciseness of some of the verse tales occasionally wins a word. It is plain, indeed, that Meredith is indemnifying himself for the length and complexity of his novels and exercising a gift that was commonly submerged. 'Action!—action!—he sighed for it', he had written of his hero in *Evan Harrington*, 'as I have done since I came to know that his history must be morally developed.'¹ It is also plain, though it does not seem to have been so to his earlier critics, that nearly all the verse narratives, whatever their setting—Greek, Hunnish, Provençal, Austrian—can be readily related to the ideas that dominated his mind. They are not detached romantic excursions, to be doubtfully compared to the verse tales of Scott or Morris, as his first reviewers compared them. They are, however, largely free of Meredith's characteristic didactic passages, and this has meant that their nature has been far less widely recognized than that of the mythological pieces of *Poems and Lyrics of the Joy of Earth* and *A Reading of Earth*, which, where they were not explicit themselves, were recognized by the company they kept. 'Idéologie que l'*Apaisement de Démétér*!' wrote Constantin Photiadès in 1910;² 'idéologie encore que sa charmante allégorie printanière, *le Jour de la Fille de Hadès*! idéologie encore que sa parabole silvestre du bon docteur, Mélampus!'. But of *Ballads and Poems of Tragic Life* Richard Le Gallienne said briefly that they were full of fine things but were, nevertheless, 'studies in the conventional subjects of tragedy'.³ Ideological is, indeed, too strong a description for these poems; the burden they carry is not so weighty; but neither should they be dismissed as studies in conventional subjects. They present stages in the evolution of human society and examples of the position and influence of women in it. 'This way have men come out of brutishness'⁴ might serve as epigraph to *The Young Princess*, and before *Archduchess Anne* we could write, 'Of this, too, we must take account'.

¹ Chap. xxxvi.

² *George Meredith, sa vie—son imagination—son art—sa doctrine* (Paris, 1910), p. 194.

³ *George Meredith, Some Characteristics* (London, 1890), p. 108.

⁴ *Meredith, Hymn to Colour*.

This is to assert no more than that the tragic scenes, complete in themselves, are yet attached to the branches of the evolutionary tree, as we find miniatures perched in the branches of the Jesse-tree in medieval manuscripts; and the relevance of this assertion to *Periander*, the poem under consideration, and its partner *Bellerophon* is simply that we should expect to find in them something more than antique tales, retold for what they are worth. They are not, however, susceptible of the same sort of approach as the other narratives, or, rather, they are not much illumined by it. *Periander*, it is true, reflects an early stage of social organization, since its events depend on the position of its hero as tyrant of Corinth (625?–585 B.C.), but its interest arises not from the typical but from the special nature of the story; everything turns on the particular relations between Periander and his son Lycophron. *Bellerophon*, with its legendary hero and generalized background, bears hardly any traces of Meredith's evolutionary passion. We must look elsewhere for the stimulus that provoked the two poems.

The tale of *Periander* can be found in the third book of the *Histories* of Herodotus, exactly as Meredith repeats it, except for some details that he omits or simplifies. An acquaintance with Herodotus may help in the immediate perception of the content of some of his condensed phrases, but no reader of modern poetry is likely to experience any difficulty with it, or to share W. E. Henley's exasperation at its enigmatic beginning.¹

How died Melissa none dares shape in words,
A woman who is wife despotic lords
Count faggot at the question, Shall she live!

It seems clear enough. We enter the subject through the unspoken surmise of Corinth that its passionate lord, to whom suspicion itself is conclusive, carries the guilt of his wife's death. The last three lines of the six-line stanza set before us her unreconciled son, who 'because his brows were black of her', is an unfriended outcast, a 'cur', in his father's city. The next four stanzas characterize the superb, magnanimous sovereign and his subservient Corinth, well ruled and tightly controlled. As the years pass, however, Periander realizes that the only heir who can curb his people and prolong the glory of his line is 'that hard son', 'that rebel with his mother in his brows'. There follows the encounter of the two stubborn wills:

The youth was tossing pebbles in the sea;
A figure shunned along the busy quay,
Perforce of the harsh edict for who dared
Address him outcast. Naming it, he crossed
His father's look with look that proved them paired
For stiffness, and another pebble tossed.

¹ Review of *Ballads and Poems of Tragic Life* (*Athenaeum*, 11 June 1887).

Lycophron's only answer is to remind his father that he has now incurred the penalty he himself imposed. Periander thereupon exiles his son to 'the Island'—Corcyra, though Meredith does not use the name—and more years pass, until the ageing king, anxious for the future of his state, begins to regard his proud son as a 'young Periander', 'from the shadow cleared | That haunted his rebellious brows', and sends his daughter to Corcyra to bring back her brother. The peace-offering is accepted, and a fleet sets forth to bring back as prince the son 'who had subdued him'. Waiting for him, Periander examines himself:

Errors aforetime unperceived were bared,
To be by his young masterful repaired:
Renewed his great ideas gone to smoke.

The size of the fleet, however, has alarmed the islanders to violence, and it is Lycophron's dead body that is brought home.

The nucleus of the poem is the estrangement of father and son and their belated and abortive reconciliation. Such an estrangement the poet had experienced in his own life, and it is remarkable how readily Herodotus' story lends itself to typify the relations between Meredith and his eldest son, Arthur. The sensitive, proud boy, who in childhood had been the object of loving solicitude for his proud and sensitive father, had broken away from him after his second marriage. He had been sent abroad to school and had stayed there as an adult, finding work for himself, refusing help from his father, and having, it appears, as little to do with him as possible, short of a complete break. The causes of this estrangement were probably not simple, and not all of them can be expected to tally with Herodotus' story. Two most important causes, however, do tally. There is the likeness between the two men—not a likeness of intellect in this case, for Meredith could not think very much of his son's brain, and probably let him see it—but of pride, reserve, and wounded stubbornness. Moreover, Meredith seems himself to have resisted his father's affection, as Arthur resisted his. Secondly, there is the relation of both father and son to the dead wife and mother. Mary Meredith had left her husband when Arthur was five years old, and when she returned to his neighbourhood, disillusioned and ill, he had refused to see her, and had only near the end of her life permitted the small son, whom she passionately loved, to visit her. We have no evidence that it was resentment at the treatment of his mother, when he came to know of it, that alienated Arthur from his father, but it is certain that he resented Meredith's remarriage, and it was to his half-sister, his mother's daughter by her former husband, that he turned in manhood for affection. However, it is neither necessary nor enlightening to proceed by matching minor facts and differentiating between details.

All we ought to seek to establish is the existence of a likeness between the situations of Periander and of Meredith, strong enough to turn the data of the former's story into symbols, not so much of the facts of the poet's personal experience as of the potentialities he was aware of in it and in himself. Meredith did not kill his wife, but in his dealings with her he must have found cause for suspicion, if not conviction, of his own guiltiness, however his reason may have resisted it. He did not, perhaps, ever explicitly condemn his own actions and abstentions, and we have certainly no right to do so, but, even before Mary Meredith died, he had condemned with severity Sir Austin Feverel's unforgiving pride. In the same way, we need not suppose that his reason accused him of tyrannous dealings with Arthur—the biographical facts suggest nothing more culpable than somewhat heavy-handed mistakes in tact and, later, some negligence—when he recognized his own *persona* in the tyrant of Corinth. The poem is not biography, but a symbol through which he could express the shock of his painful and self-accusing emotions. The intensity of the climactic verse makes this clear. This is not the verse that records the death of the son, but the explanation that follows:

Who struck the man thrown open to young joy?
The image of the mother of his boy
Came forth from his unwary breast in wreaths,
With eyes. And shall a woman, that extinct,
Smite out of dust the Powerful who breathes?
Her loved the son; her served; they lay close-linked.

The survival of the past—a past thirty years buried for Meredith—is perceived with resentment, remorse, and recognition. It has not been overlived. It gushes out of the father's 'unwary breast' like a vapour, taking accusing shape, and released by the likeness of the dead son to his mother. Meredith, however, does not end his poem on this climax. He follows Periander to his revenge on Corcyra,

to prove on free Hellenes
How prompt the Tyrant for the Persian dye;
How black his Gods behind their marble screens.

The lines, with their concluding political reflection, can be read as Meredith's gesture of disassociation from the ancient city-building, city-sacking tyrant of Herodotus; or perhaps, on the other hand, a self-condemning vibration may still be detected in them. It was the historical Periander who beautified Corinth with the great temple of Apollo and built the fountain for the spring, Pirene, to which Meredith makes him proudly refer; but 'marble screens' can stand for the structures of any art, even Meredith's own.

When the poem was published for the first time in *Ballads and Poems of Tragic Life* Arthur had still over three years to live. He suffered from tuberculosis, however, and, though his father had not lost hope, the possibility of an early death had been recognized. We do not know when *Periander* was written, but it seems most likely that its inception is to be connected with the shock Meredith felt when he heard, in summer 1881, not directly but through a friend, that Arthur was ill. He wrote at once, 'struck to the heart', as he said, by the bad news, seeking to bridge the gap between them, praising his son, pressing him warmly to come home, promising him working-space in the garden-chalet where he himself wrote, and offering him money, as to a sensitive stranger.¹ Four days later he was able to open his proud heart wider:

We have been long estranged, my dear boy, and I awake from it with a shock that wrings me. The elder should be the first to break through such divisions, for he knows best the tenure and the nature of life. But our last parting gave me the idea that you did not care for me.²

That was the cardinal experience, whether it was then or at some later point in the fluctuations of Arthur's decline that Meredith found in Herodotus the means of self-purgation. Late in 1886 there must have been another period of enhanced realization, when Arthur was lying ill at St. Thomas's Home, where Meredith visited him,³ and this would fit in well enough with the publication of *Periander* in the spring. But we do not know; and, once the initial impulse has been given, a poet's creative hours are not necessarily geared to the calendar of his private life. Nor does the sequence of images that has been activated necessarily stop at the point that life has reached. Under such a shock as Meredith received in Arthur's illness, the mind, understanding itself, leaps forward to apprehend and intensify the coming sorrow. It is hardly prophecy; rather a logical deduction from known premisses. Something of this kind may have happened when Meredith wrote *Modern Love*. Two poets have come to different conclusions about the probable date of these fifty sonnets in which Meredith, varying the adjuncts, analysed the truth of the breakdown of his first marriage. Mary Meredith died in October 1861, and *Modern Love and Poems of the English Roadside* was published at the end of April 1862. Mr. Siegfried Sassoon thinks that Meredith would not have been free to undertake his 'exercise in self-scrutiny' until after his wife's death had released in him the power to forgive her.⁴ Mr. C. Day Lewis thinks that its 'basic theme

¹ Meredith, *Letters* (London, 1912), 19 June 1881.

² *Ibid.*, 23 June 1881.

³ *Ibid.*, 26 Oct. 1886, to Admiral Maxse.

⁴ *Meredith* (London, 1948), pp. 48-49.

had been contemplated, many of its key images formed, and perhaps a few detached sonnets written, before this'.¹ There is no conclusive evidence, but the case of *Periander* throws the likelihood a little on Mr. Day Lewis's side, and even strengthens it, since, if the process of the imagination that created *Periander* was characteristic of Meredith, we need no longer suppose that the dramatic outline of *Modern Love* 'was given to the poem after Mary Meredith's death'. Mary's illness, like Arthur's, foreshadowed the end, and the poet's imagination, winged by foreknowledge and inner knowledge, occupied the day that had not yet come, and surveyed the past, illumined and ordered by its severe light.

It is an odd fact, though without relevance for the understanding of *Periander*, that during the time between the publication of the poem and Arthur's death, the young man's circumstances continued to approximate to those of Lycophron. He embarked on a sea-voyage to improve his health, and Meredith, appeased by good news from Australia, waited hopefully for his return. Arthur's half-sister, Mrs. Clarke (Edith Nicolls), played the gentle part of Lycophron's sister, when Meredith begged her to mediate between them, and persuade his son to abandon his pride and to accept money from him. These things are curiosities, and perhaps the supplementary details that Meredith would have found, if he pursued the figure of Periander to Plutarch's *Banquet of the Seven Sages* and the *Lives of Eminent Philosophers* of Diogenes Laertius, are no more. They are strangely appropriate, however. Plutarch presents the Corinthian tyrant as the patron of poetry and philosophy, and Diogenes Laertius recounts that he wrote a didactic poem of 2,000 lines. It is not likely that these minor parallels, if he was aware of them, added much to the compulsion that exacted the poem from Meredith. He may even have observed them with grim amusement. If he knew that Periander's qualifications for his position as one of the Seven Sages had been criticized as insufficient, he may have felt the touch of a smarting irony, but it leaves no mark on his picture of the passionate, dominant man. But, so far as they go, these details might reinforce that merging of self in a recorded and imagined figure, which is always short of complete self-identification.

There is, however, one defining stroke in the figure of Lycophron of which we can be sure. It was not drawn from Herodotus or Plutarch, but from life. Three times Meredith emphasizes Lycophron's brows, twice with a double meaning. When he writes: 'Her son, because his brows were black of her' and: 'That rebel with the mother in his brows' he means both that Lycophron's lowering brows showed that he remembered his mother's injuries, and that they resembled hers. This resemblance is

¹ Introduction to *Modern Love* (London, 1948), p. xvii.

extended in the culminating moment of the poem, when Periander encounters his dead son:

The image of the mother of his boy
Came forth from his unwary breast in wreaths,
With eyes.

Here the force of the last two syllables seems to derive, not only from the succeeding metrical pause, but from a likeness and a contrast we hardly have time to apprehend, between the accusing eyes of the mother, as they still live in the tyrant's memory, and the closed eyes of the son, that accuse no longer. Whoever will compare the photograph of Arthur before page 175 of S. M. Ellis's *George Meredith, his Life and Friends in Relation to his Work* (2nd edn., London, 1920) with the reproduction of a drawing of his mother, made in the year in which she left her husband, in the ninth volume of the Halliford edition of the *Works* of Thomas Love Peacock, will see the likeness that informed Meredith's imagination. The sensitive, arched, strongly marked brows—the most striking features in both faces—the shape of the eyes and eyelids, the broad, high forehead and its proportion to the nose and chin, the beautiful mouth, these were all transmitted, with hardly any variation, by Mary Meredith to her son. The expressions are different. The mother was caught, as far as can be judged from an amateur's drawing, in a relaxed open mood. Arthur faces the camera with what looks like a habitually wary, or perhaps inhibited, reserve. But the image of the mother in the son is unmistakable, and serves as a stamp to authenticate the genuine metal out of which Meredith forged *Periander*. I hope it can now be recognized, to quote Mr. C. Day Lewis on *Modern Love*, as 'an intensely personal poem in which real experience has, for the sake of art and decorum, been given a fictional (or a historical) disguise'.

It is worth while looking at *Bellerophon* in the light of the foregoing argument. *Bellerophon* does not stand to gain as a poem by a reference to the personal emotions that may have generated it, as *Periander* seems to do. It is self-explanatory and complete, a beautiful and moving thing. 'The effect of *Bellerophon*', wrote Henley in the *Athenaeum* review, to which reference has already been made, 'is that of one of Rembrandt's most tragic pictures; that of *Periander* . . . one rather of heroic intention than complete achievement'; and Mr. Sassoon, who does not mention *Periander*, calls *Bellerophon* 'a most satisfactory classical picture'.¹ The poem is not a narrative; the events are all in the past, forgotten by the world and incomprehensible by the broken hero, who wanders unrecognized in crippled old age, begging his bread from a charitable but preoccupied peasantry, who hear his confused babbling with 'patient inattention'. They have learnt

¹ *Meredith*, p. 196.

from their fathers of a hero who controlled a winged horse with a golden bit, the gift of a Goddess, and slew a monster, but they do not connect him with the old wanderer. Men saw him set out to ascend Olympus, and then he disappeared.

He fell: and says the shattered man, I fell:
And sweeps an arm the height an eagle wins;
And in his breast a mouthless well
Heaves the worn patches of his coat of skins.

Lo, this is he in whom the surges springs
Of recollections, richer than our skies
To feed the flow of tuneful strings,
Show but a pool of scum for shooting flies.

There is enough general meaning here to eclipse what contribution the poet's particular experience may have made to his poem. We can discern through a noble symbol the isolation of experience, oblivion annulling heroic achievement, the failure of contact between the hero and the crowd, and between the survivors of one generation and their successors. We can discern also the action of age, weakening body and mind, turning the 'martial prince' into 'a crazy beggar grateful for a meal', and, proceeding from the traditional interpretation of the winged horse as inspiration, we can discern the poet fallen on silence, 'Spurned of the hoof that sprang the Hippocrene', and suffering the interdiction of communication. This is a rich load for a poem of under fifty lines. It is, then, chiefly in support of my reading of *Periander* and of my conception of the way in which Meredith's imagination worked when he wrote it, that I suggest that *Bellerophon* is connected with the failure of his own physical strength. Like *Periander*, it is not dated and did not see the light before it appeared in *Ballads and Poems of Tragic Life*. Exact dating, however, is not necessary. The poem seems to grow out of Meredith's reflections on the gradual decay of his health and on his lack of success as a poet, which he always esteemed his essential function. Here again the imagination leaps forward to purge the trouble, not by an exact picture of his plight, but by a statement far in excess of it. The vehement, proud nature runs on the spears. During the sixth decade of his life, which closed a year after the publication of *Ballads and Poems of Tragic Life*, Meredith was not yet wholly crippled by the locomotor ataxy which is now ascribed to the continuous nervous overstrain of his life; but it had made itself felt, and the great joyous walks, and the throwing of the beetle as a specific against melancholy, were things of the past.¹ He felt no deterioration in his mind; he insists to Arthur in

¹ Cf. letter to R. L. Stevenson, 24 March 1884: 'I have developed a spinal malady and can walk not much more than a mile. . . . I am a cripple.'

their renewed correspondence of 1881 that his work is as good as ever;¹ but the image of heroic strength in total decay naturally involves such a degeneration.

Maimed, beggared, grey; seeking an alms; with nod
 Of palsy doing task of thanks for bread;
 Upon the stature of a God
 He whom the Gods have struck bends low his head.

As for his poetry, he had found its 'failure' sour enough to digest. He had to find the money to publish it himself; and, though it received generous praise, he could take no satisfaction in the approval of critics who often failed to see what the poems were about. The appropriate symbols for high ambition and failure lay ready to hand in the legend; the winged horse which is inspiration; the golden bit of Athena to control him, which is wisdom; the Chimaera, which is the multiform and monstrous error against which Meredith had tilted all his days; and the fall when the Gods strike down the bold rider 'midway' up the height of Olympus. Here the power of the symbol takes command, and requires to reach its own perfection. Bellerophon is spurned by Pegasus; he is neither a poet nor a theme of poetry. He is voiceless, his life submerged. Meredith, meanwhile, was proving how smoothly on occasion he could rein his Pegasus and to what heights he could ascend, in the very poem in which he describes the derelict.

Bellerophon has no moral; it is truly a poem of tragic life. We are not told, as Meredith might well have told us, that the country profited by the slaughter of the Chimaera, or that even the confused legend of the exploit held a seed capable of noble growth. The poet concentrates on his tragic hero, and does not look forward, and the same might be said of *Periander*. Between these two poems, which are placed at the end of the book, however, he printed another, *Solon*, which is fully explicit morally and faces the future. *Solon* is linked to its neighbours by its Greek subject and—possibly—by its origin in this phase of Meredith's life. We cannot be sure, however, for *Solon* is a poem that might have appeared in any of his collections; it says what he continually said at all stages of his work, and is informed, though not at all automatically, by his convinced and almost professional hopefulness. Its source is in a statement in Plutarch's *Lives* that Solon, the lawgiver of Athens, and Peisistratus, the first tyrant of the city, were cousins and remained personally friendly in spite of their divergent political beliefs. On this statement, modifying it a little, Meredith builds a scene and a meditation. Solon, 'of the light-in-cavern look', sits where the tyrant—Meredith's verse has no room for his name—rides past

¹ Letters, 23 June 1881.

him on his way to 'his high seat upon the sacred rock', and the two men eye one another. Peisistratus, who has defaced Solon's work, has no hostility to his kinsman; he admires him, a little maliciously, but thinks his wisdom fit only for twos and threes, not for the herd, who need the crook and rein supplied by his own actions. Solon feels the mock, but, left alone, gathers courage to dismiss the scorn and regret that hinder understanding. The Athenians were unripe for his laws, but there is still the future to look to:

The times are overcast
But still may they who sowed behind the plough
True seed fix in the mind an unborn Now
To make the plagues afflicting us things past.

Here we are on the plain Meredithian highroad; twilight is here, but there is no need to lose faith in our direction. This is a public poem. The *persona* is Solon, the wise man whose claim to wisdom posterity has never challenged, though his contemporaries were not ready for him, very different from Periander, whose appearance among the sages may have been a mistake, or Bellerophon, whose excessive ambition, whether justly or unjustly, incurred chastisement. *Solon*, then, may be regarded as the voice of reason, audible between two utterances of what is deeper than reason, fear and guilt. Placed between the other two poems, it restores balance, reaffirms fortitude, and plays its part in the partly involuntary stocktaking that seems to have occupied Meredith's genius in the years preceding Arthur's death, and his own passage into old age. It is not shallow; it is never shallow to face the alternations of progress and regress in civilization with a serious hope. But it is a poem of the will, creditable to the poet, and not nearly so moving or beautiful as either of its partners. And, in effect, Meredith's fortitude is more fully expressed in the passion, courage, and art of the two tragic poems than by the reassurance of the third.

Oliver Elton said that Meredith's poetry was 'the diary of his inner biography, which no one yet has tried to write'.¹ This paper is an attempt to read the cipher of one of the entries.

¹ *A Survey of English Literature* (London, 1920), ii. 327.

NOTES

THE PROPHETIC LABEL IN CYMBELINE

WHEN as a lion's whelp shall, to himself unknown, without seeking find, and be embrac'd by a piece of tender air: and when from a stately cedar shall be lopp'd branches, which, being dead many years, shall after revive, be jointed to the old stock, and freshly grow, then shall Posthumus end his miseries, Britain be fortunate, and flourish in peace and plenty.¹

The authenticity of this 'label' has often been questioned by Shakespearian commentators, although recently there has been more reluctance to see hands other than Shakespeare's in *Cymbeline*. One small fact, however, does help to establish the label as genuinely Shakespeare's work. This fact has either gone unnoticed, or has been ignored and forgotten because its significance was not clear.

The prophecy that the miseries of Britain shall end when severed branches grow again to a tree must derive in one way or another from medieval accounts of a famous death-bed vision of St. Edward the Confessor, the last of the West Saxon kings, who died in 1066. An account of this vision is contained first in Edward's *Biography*, which most scholars believe to have been written between 1066 and 1075.² Later writers and chroniclers copied and adapted this story, and when Edward was officially canonized in 1161 and Ailred of Rievaulx wrote his *Vita* for the occasion, he made out that the prophecy had been fulfilled in the person of Henry II, who traced his descent on his mother's side back to Malcolm of Scotland and Margaret, and so to the West Saxon royal house.³ From the twelfth century onwards, either with or without Ailred's interpretation of it, St. Edward's vision was part of the English chronicle-tradition.

The story was printed very early in English by William Caxton in *The Golden Legend* (? 1483). The account given there of St. Edward's vision derives ultimately from Ailred. Briefly it is as follows: Edward, 'in a trance', spoke to two religious men he had known in Normandy in his youth. There was talk of the miseries of England, and Edward asked 'if there were any remedy'. The answer was:

A green tree cut from his stock shall be divided from his proper root the space of three furlongs, and without man's hand shall turn again to his old root, and take again his sap and flourisheth and bringeth forth fruit, and when this is done there may come remedy.

¹ *Cymbeline* v. iv. 138 ff., ed. J. M. Nosworthy (London, 1955). Cf. v. v. 436 ff.

² Ed. H. R. Luard, *Lives of Edward the Confessor* (London, 1858).

³ *Vita S. Edwardi Regis* in Migne, *Patrologia Latina*, cxcv, cols. 773-4.

Caxton then gives an exposition of the prophecy: 'The tree is cut down from the stock when the realm is divided and translated from one seed or lineage to another.' Each phrase of the prophecy is glossed substantially as in Ailred, and Henry II is the fruit of the tree's reunion.¹

Robert Fabyan, in his *New Chronicles of England and France*, gives an account of St. Edward's vision, but does not expound the prophecy, referring the reader to Edward's *Life* 'translated by Wylyam Caxton, in the boke called ye Legeant of Sayntes'.²

Descriptions of this vision and prophecy are to be found in so many different places that no decision about the immediate source of the label in *Cymbeline* can be reached through comparisons alone. But it can be assumed in the first instance that Shakespeare wrote *Cymbeline*, and that he also wrote *Macbeth*; and the burden of proof rests on those who see non-Shakespearian interpolations in either play. Now it is beyond reasonable doubt that Shakespeare read Holinshed's account of the reign of Edward the Confessor in *The Historie of England*, because in *Macbeth*, v. ix. 1-19, mention is made of how Siward's son died valiantly, with 'his hurts before', and the death of Siward's son is not mentioned in Holinshed's *Historie of Scotland*, which Shakespeare otherwise followed in *Macbeth*.³ Nor can there be reasonable doubt that Shakespeare drew on the Scottish chronicle when writing *Cymbeline*, for it is from the Scottish chronicle that the story of 'Two boys, an old man twice a boy, a lane' comes.⁴ Hence Shakespeare's use of Holinshed's English and Scottish histories is reflected both in *Cymbeline* and in *Macbeth*. When, therefore, it is found that Holinshed describes St. Edward's death-bed vision, in the very section which we already know Shakespeare read for *Macbeth* (the death of Siward's son), it seems highly probable that Holinshed was the source of the tree-image in the prophetic label of *Cymbeline*.

The parts of Holinshed which may be relevant are these:

(i) When a greene tree is cut in sunder in the middle, and the parte cut off, is carried three acres brewd from the stocke, and returning agayne to the stoale, shall ioyne therewith, and begin to budde and beare fruite after the former

¹ Quotations from *The Golden Legend, or Lives of the Saints as Englisched by William Caxton* (London, 1900), vi. 28-32.

² Only the 1811 reprint of Pynson's edition of 1516 has been available to me: in the reprint, pp. 231-2, cf. p. 269.

³ *Macbeth*, ed. K. Muir (London, 1951), pp. xlvi, 168, 187. In iv. iii mention is made of the King's Evil; this too is apparently based on Holinshed's account of Edward the Confessor, as Muir remarks in his notes to ll. 140-59. Edward was not the first English king to touch for the scrofula (see M. Bloch, *Les Rois thaumaturges* (Paris and Strasbourg, 1924)) though his biographers made out that he was, in order, Bloch argues, to give authority to Henry I's practice of the custom.

⁴ Nosworthy, xiv-xv, 197-8.

manner, by reason of the sap renewing the accustomed nourishmente, then I say, may there be hope that such euils shall ceasse and diminish.

(ii) Oh Lorde God Almighty, if thys bee not a vaine fantastical illusion, but a true vision which I haue seene, graunt me space to vtter the same vnto these that stande heere presente, or else not.

(iii) [St Edward] raued nowe in hys sicknesse, as men of great yeares use to do.¹

(iv) [Marginal heading] Braunches of trees.²

Quotations (i), (ii), (iii) are from Holinshed's account of the Confessor's reign in the English chronicle; (iv) is in the Scottish chronicle, and refers to the coming of Birnam wood to Dunsinane. The first three passages are not in Boswell-Stone, which perhaps is why editors and commentators have not noticed them.³

While it is impossible to reconstruct the nature of Shakespeare's poetic inspiration, I think one can see from Holinshed how the prophetic label in *Cymbeline* might have been made. Quotation (i) above supplied the basic idea, which was then modified partly by notions of trees representing royal descent, of cedars and Phoenix trees and so on.⁴ It is just conceivable that (iv) brought about the change from Holinshed's 'cut in sunder' to Shakespeare's 'lopp'd branches'. It is rather more probable that (ii) and (iii) above are reflected in Posthumus's words when he awakes and reads the label:

'Tis still a dream: or else such stuff as madmen
Tongue, and brain not: either both, or nothing,
Or senseless speaking, or a speaking such
As sense cannot untie.⁵

But such conjectural details aside, the general debt of Shakespeare to Holinshed is plain.

Some objections may be anticipated, and I think answered. Holinshed does not make the significance of the tree explicit, nor does he seem to know that Henry II was the fruit of the reunion. Caxton and Fabyan, for example, understood these things better. Caxton, ultimately following Ailred of Rievaulx, gives a detailed exposition of the prophecy, an exposition which is paralleled by the Soothsayer's reading of the label in *Cym-*

¹ Raphael Holinshed, *The Firste volume of the Chronicles of England, Scotland, and Irelande* (London, 1577, S.T.C. 13568a), pp. 279-80; in the 1807 reprint vol. i. 754-5. I have not had access to the other edns. of Holinshed.

² *Historie of Scotland* (1577 edn.), p. 251.

³ W. G. Boswell-Stone, *Shakspere's Holinshed* (London, 1896).

⁴ Nosworthy, lxxxi-lxxxiv; G. Wilson Knight, *The Crown of Life* (London, 1948), p. 197.

⁵ *Cymbeline*, v. iv. 146 ff.

belne v. v., especially 'The lofty cedar, royal Cymbeline, | Personates thee.' This may be compared with Caxton's 'The tree signifieth the realm of England' and Ailred's 'Arbor hæc regnum Anglorum significat'. Moreover, the Soothsayer's point-by-point gloss of the label corresponds to the exposition of Ailred and his successors in a general way; but there is nothing similar in Holinshed.

The answer to such objections would be that it is strictly unnecessary to assume that Shakespeare would have needed more than is in Holinshed; that there are otherwise good grounds for believing that he had read the relevant parts of Holinshed; and that the possibility of his having also read about St. Edward's vision elsewhere can be neither proved nor disproved. In *Macbeth* Shakespeare had dealt in prophecies and expounded their meaning, and *Cymbeline* is not a scholar's attempt at legendary history, but a poetic drama.¹

H. L. ROGERS

DRYDEN'S MESSIANIC ECLOGUE

THERE is a considerable body of evidence to suggest that Dryden's early translation² of Virgil's Fourth, or Messianic, Eclogue was originally conceived as an imitative translation to celebrate the birth of the first child of Princess, later Queen, Anne. Her marriage to Prince George of Denmark was solemnized on 28 July 1683, and her pregnancy in the winter of 1683–4 aroused public interest and hopes. She had been reared a devout Protestant and might provide a regular Stuart succession which would, after the death of James, assure a national unity acceptable to the moderate men of both parties. (Anne's elder sister, Mary, was evidently assumed to be sterile—see p. 302, n. 1.) Her child was stillborn on 30 April 1684, however, and if Dryden had hoped to publish his translation as an imitative panegyric, the occasion had not come about. His only means of publication was inclusion in a miscellany.

Some of the evidence supporting this hypothesis can be found by a care-

¹ I am indebted to my colleagues in the University of Sydney for help in the writing of this paper.

² The early translation was published with that of Eclogue IX in *Miscellany Poems* (1684), Part Two, pp. 30–34. The translators of the other eclogues included Duke, Tate, and the Earl of Roscommon—a group of Dryden's friends which perhaps made up those whom Roscommon attempted to form into an English academy. My concept of imitative translation grows in part from the excellent article by Harold F. Brooks—"The 'Imitation' in English Poetry, especially in Formal Satire, before the Age of Pope", *R.E.S.*, xxv (1949), 124–40—where he compares (p. 133) the freedom taken by French writers of imitations with 'the English line of imitations that were also translations'.

ful comparison of the translation with the Virgilian text. Dryden's changes are sometimes slight, sometimes stylistic,¹ sometimes ambiguous; but others are difficult to explain, given his usual practice or the nature of the original. He strangely does not translate at all the first half of Virgil l. 6 ('Iam reddit et Virgo'); strangely, because the 'Virgin' (Astraea or Justice) was taken to be a major proof of the Messianic prediction of the poem accepted by Dryden and his age; and because he had quoted the line whole as the epigraph for *Astraea Redux*. A second alteration is the change from Virgil's iterated address and reference to the child's father (11–14, 26) to third-person address and omission (Dryden, 14, 16, 32), a considerable reduction of his role. Such alteration surely must be accounted for, since Dryden's headnote reads: '*The Poet Celebrates the Birth-day of Saloni[nus], the Son of Pollio . . .*'.² It is certainly not his practice to diminish the roles played by characters in the situations of his poems. The earlier portion of the headnote makes another alteration seem yet more puzzling—his change from Virgil's direct address to the child (e.g. 18: 'At tibi . . . puer') to a kind of indirect address until the end of the poem where, indeed, only direct address would make sense. A fourth alteration is ambiguous: the new Argo is to sail to 'th' Iberian shore'. If Dryden meant the ancient land near the Caucasus, he merely expanded upon Virgil; if he meant Spain (or both the Caucasus and Spain), his intent was topical and metaphorical.

Such alterations fit perfectly with the hypothesis of tribute to Anne. The focus on the mother is understandable—both in the reduction of the father's role and the change from direct address to the child—when Prince George's initial unpopularity, the importance of Anne, and the unforeseeable sex of the child are considered. Anne was obviously no longer a maiden princess, so that the omitted half-line ('Iam reddit et Virgo') was awkward for her—and for Charles as well, since it might imply his reign lacked justice. If Dryden's prediction that 'Another Argos on th' Iberian Shore | Shall land the chosen Chiefs' is indeed metaphorical and refers to Spain, it must grow from Charles's concern in 1683–4 to strengthen the Royal Navy. Dryden's interest in naval affairs is somewhat obscure in motivation but plain in many passages of *Annus Mirabilis* and *Threnodia Augustalis* (see 509–17). Possibly he patriotically hoped that at some future date a son of Anne would conquer Spain, where the problems of succession, monarchy, and the intrigues of Louis XIV seemed to be preparing a situation like that when 'Edward the Black Prince, [had subdued] Spain,

¹ Several changes of omission and addition are in the spirit of translation and so do not concern my thesis. Dryden reduces in ll. 22–24 the number of plants Virgil mentions (18–20) and generalizes for readers unfamiliar with Mediterranean flora; and adds in his eighth line the striking image of 'mighty years' running 'in radiant Circles'.

² *Miscellany*, Part Two, p. 30.

and [restored] it to the Lawful Prince, though a Great Tyrant, *Don Pedro the Cruel*.¹ He had long considered this exploit for his projected epic, 'wherein, after *Virgil* and *Spencer*, I wou'd have taken occasion to represent my living Friends and Patrons of the Noblest Families, and also shadow'd the Events of future Ages, in the Succession of our Imperial Line'.² The concern was certainly in his mind in 1685 when he wrote *Threnodia Augustalis* (see 470–90, 509–17), and it seems wholly reasonable that the rebuilding of the navy in the two years preceding should have led him to such patriotic reflections in 1684. There is, then, sufficient *a priori* reason for his making Eclogue IV serve a dual purpose like that of his projected epic—translation and 'shadow'd' allusion to contemporary events.

Dryden had precedent enough for such a prediction in the prophecies made by Whigs and Tories alike during the 'year of wonders', in such poems as his own *Astraea Redux* and, of more immediate relevance, in the very similar prophecies made a few months earlier, when many poets had celebrated the marriage of Princess Anne. In 1683 dozens of writers contributed Latin, Greek, and English poems to a *Hymenaeus Cantabrigiensis* celebrating the marriage by referring to George as a warrior, a hero, or a Mars and to Anne as a virgin, a Venus, a goddess, and notably even another Helen. (In his translation Dryden adds a line, 44, on Helen which has no counterpart in Virgil.) Ste. Cressar, for example, looked upon Anne as 'multis ipsa faelix | Principibus genetrix futura'; and Dryden's friend and a collaborator in translating the Eclogues for the first *Miscellany*, Richard Duke, predicted that

The shaken Throne more surely fixt shall stand,
And curs'd Rebellion fly the happy Land!
At Your blest Union Civil Discords cease,
Confusion turns to Order, Rage to Peace.³

John Newton speculated that Prince George might have heard from afar 'of Anaks in Rebellion, | Of Shimei's, Zimri's, and false Absolon'.⁴ That concern of many of these writers which is most significant for Dryden's translation is their hope for an heir from the princely union. Thomas Walker stated the matter in its most essential terms—'A Prince for Wales is all the Nations prayer—but writers like John Adams seem even to have had the end of Virgil's Eclogue IV in mind:

¹ *The Satires of Decimus Junius Juvenalis* (1693), p. xiii; W. P. Ker, *Essays of John Dryden* (Oxford, 1900), ii. 38.

² *Ibid.*

³ Ste. Cressar, *Hymenaeus Cantabrigiensis* (London, 1683), sig. M4^r; Duke, *ibid.*, sig. P 2^r. I have not followed the italic printing of the English originals.

⁴ *Ibid.*, sig. S 3^r.

Methinks e're ten full Months compleat their round,
 Methinks I see our eager wishes crown'd,
 A smiling Infant do's His Beams display,
 Sweet as the dawning light of new born day.¹

There is also evidence that the Messianic prophecy was publicly applied to Princess Anne. Evelyn records a sermon by Francis Turner, Bishop of Rochester, at St. James's Chapel on Christmas Day, 1683. Dr. Turner preached, he writes, 'on 9 Isa.: 6, 7. Historically showing how Christ was typified in the Old Testament, prophesied of even by heathens, as *Sibylla Cumana* by Virgil.' Dr. de Beer strongly suggests that the sermon alluded to Anne, who was present.²

Such circumstantial evidence points Dryden's translation towards Princess Anne, and although I have not been able to discover any contemporary statement that he had planned his translation as a tribute, some additional support is given to the hypothesis by another fact. Four English versions of Eclogue IV were printed in *Poems on Affairs of State . . . to this Present Year 1703*. The first, *The Golden Age Restor'd*, is a Tory imitation of Virgil by Dryden's friend William Walsh. The second is none other than Dryden's translation. The third is *The Golden Age Revers'd*, a Whig answer to Walsh, which contains an allusion to Anne—'When Whigs again shall rouse the drooping Land | Unnerv'd and weaken'd by a Female Hand.' The fourth is a Tory imitation addressed to Anne.³ Given the prevailingly political nature of *Poems on Affairs of State* and the context of three imitations undoubtedly political in aim, it seems reasonable to believe that Dryden had once intended to use his translation as a tribute to Anne and her then unborn child, and even that his plans were known to some of his contemporaries. If his aim was frustrated by later events, it seems none the less to have had a lasting effect upon certain aspects of his translation; for if it is not his finest work of this kind, it is yet sufficiently graceful, forceful, elevated, and—as I have contended—prophetic in purpose to be termed his Messianic Eclogue.

EARL MINER

¹ Ibid., Walker, sig. R 4^r; Adams, sig. Q 2v. Cf. Adams's lines with Dryden, 77–78, and Virgil, 60–62. It will be noted that all the writers assume a place in the succession for Anne's children and ignore Mary.

² E. S. de Beer, *The Diary of John Evelyn* (Oxford, 1955), iv. 357–8, vi. 47, under *Anne*. I have been unable to find a copy of this sermon.

³ *Poems on Affairs of State, From the Reign of King James the First to this Present Year 1703*, vol. ii (1703). Walsh's imitation appears on pp. 422–5, Dryden's version on pp. 426–8, the anonymous Whiggish 'Golden Age Revers'd' on pp. 438–41 (I have quoted lines 5–6), and the anonymous Tory imitation, 'The Golden Age, from the Fourth Eclog of Virgil' on pp. 441–5.

**THE RIME OF THE ANCIENT MARINER:
A DISCOURSE ON PRAYER?**

In the Gutch Notebook Coleridge makes the following observation on prayer:

Prayer—

First Stage—the pressure of immediate calamities without earthly aidence makes us cry out to the Invisible—

Second Stage—the dreariness of visible things to a mind beginning to be contemplative—horrible Solitude.

Third Stage—Repentance & Regret—& self-inquietude.

4th Stage—The celestial delectation that follows ardent prayer—

5th Stage—Self-annihilation—the Soul enters the Holy of Holies.—¹

This entry is undated by Coleridge; but Professor Coburn, House, Lowes, and Sir Edmund Chambers agree that it was written during the period 1795–7, the years which saw Coleridge at work on *The Rime of the Ancient Mariner*. The five stages outlined by Coleridge so closely parallel the progress of his poem that one is surprised to find the passage as yet unnoted by his critics. In the version of the poem most often printed, forms of the word *pray* appear only six times, but each time in a manner which reflects important advances in the action and progress related to the poet's five stages of prayer:

I. After the Mariner slays the albatross and his fellow mariners die because of their part in his crime, he finds himself without 'earthly aidence' and exclaims:

I looked to heaven, and tried to pray;
But or ever a prayer had gusht,
A wicked whisper came, and made
My heart as dry as dust.

II. The Mariner remains alone on a becalmed sea with his dead companions, sees the curse in their eyes, and for seven days and nights lives in 'horrible Solitude', except for the 'dreariness of visible things', i.e. the water-snakes which later are instrumental in his 'Repentance & Regret—& self-inquietude'. This is the period when solitude forces his mind to become 'contemplative'.

III. A period of 'horrible Solitude' produces repentance and regret. When the Mariner spontaneously blesses the water-snakes, he remarks:

The selfsame moment I could pray;
And from my neck so free
The Albatross fell off, and sank
Like lead into the sea.

¹ *The Notebooks of Samuel Taylor Coleridge*, ed. Kathleen Coburn (New York, 1957), i, item 257.

IV. After this 'ardent prayer', a period of rest and supernatural intervention follows which may be called a 'celestial delectation'.

V. After his new-found ability to pray and as a result of his experiences with the supernatural, the Mariner indeed experiences a kind of 'self-annihilation' and through sin and severe penance becomes a teaching agent expounding upon love of the 'Holy of Holies' into which he now has insight.¹

Farewell, farewell! but this I tell
To thee, thou Wedding-Guest!
He prayeth well, who loveth well
Both man and bird and beast.
He prayeth best, who loveth best
All things both great and small;
For the dear God who loveth us,
He made and loveth all.

This moral tag near the end of the poem has been variously dealt with, or more frequently dismissed as superfluous and intrusive. Many critics agree with Professor Lowes who dismisses it as 'the Mariner's valedictory piety, which does, I fear, warrant Coleridge's (and our own) regret. . .'.² In a more recent study of Coleridge's symbolism, Professor E. E. Stoll takes the New Critics severely to task and pronounces Coleridge's final remarks an important part of his poem: 'they are in keeping with the mediaeval spirit, which was given to simple, open moralizing'.³ And Humphry House feels that the tag, when detached from the rest of the poem, constitutes simple, 'almanac art'. When, however, the tag is considered in context, House finds, 'after the richness and terror of the poem, it is no more a banal moral apothegm, but a moral which has its meaning because it has lived'.⁴ The moral at the end of the poem is, as Professor Stoll contends, 'open moralizing', but moralizing which has been systematically developed throughout. In *The Rime of the Ancient Mariner*, the central figure's ability to pray obviously indicates that a workable reconciliation to the 'Holy of Holies' has been effected. The poem is most frequently considered a comment upon man's obligation to love his fellow creatures and to observe the natural bonds which unite all creation. Such ideas are unquestionably inherent in it. But in Coleridge's sweeping moral conclusion, the word *love* is of only secondary importance. Coleridge tells us quite plainly that the ability to pray follows love.

MALCOLM WARE

¹ In Charles Lamb's letter to Wordsworth, dated 30 Jan. 1801, the essayist, writing it is true of other matters, detects the Mariner's loss of identity and 'self-annihilation': '... the Ancient Mariner undergoes such Trials, as overwhelm and bury all individuality or memory of what he was . . . one terrible peculiarity of which is: that all consciousness of personality is gone.'

² *The Road to Xanadu* (Boston, 1927), p. 302.

³ 'Symbolism in Coleridge', *P.M.L.A.*, lxiii (1948), 224.

⁴ *Coleridge* (Clark Lectures, 1951-2. London, 1953), p. 92.

CORRESPONDENCE

THE EDITOR, *Review of English Studies*

Sir,

Mr. Schanzer, in his letter in *R.E.S.*, N.S. x (1959), 292-3, suggests that those who claim to hear 'the ghostly patter of feet against which is counterpointed the actual rhythm' of lines of English verse, are importing effects undreamt of by the poet; and he challenges his readers to produce evidence from the poets themselves. But the difficulty is, in accepting the challenge, to avoid compiling an anthology of the mass of evidence which they have been providing these past four centuries or more.

Perhaps two quotations will suffice, from poets who thought deeply about metrical problems, made skilful experiments, and were, besides, expert musicians.

Thomas Campion, in his *Observations in the Art of English Poesie*, 1602, describes 'our English verses of five feet', and observes that 'the pure Iambick in English needs small demonstration, because it consists simply of Iambick feete; but our Iambick licentiate offers itselfe to a farther consideration, for in the third and fift place we must of force hold the Iambick foote, in the first, second, and fourth place we may use a Spondee or Iambick and sometime a Tribrach or Dactile, but rarely an Anapestick foote, and that in the second or fourth place'.

G. M. Hopkins has many references to feet and to counterpoint in his correspondence, and he returns to the subject in his *Author's Preface*. 'If . . . the reversal (i.e. the substitution of a trochee for an iambus) is repeated in two feet running, especially so as to include the sensitive second foot, it must be due either to great want of ear or else is a calculated effect, the superinducing or mounting of a new rhythm upon the old; and since the new or mounted rhythm is actually heard and at the same time the mind naturally supplies the natural or standard foregoing rhythm, for we do not forget what the rhythm is that by rights we should be hearing, two rhythms are in some manner running at once and we have something answerable to counterpoint in music, which is two or more strains of tune going on together, and this is Counterpoint Rhythm. Of this kind of verse Milton is the great master and the choruses of *Samson Agonistes* are written throughout in it.'

If Mr. Schanzer, when he reads verse, is really unable to hear two rhythms running at once, then the poets in their compassion can but commend to him the other harmony of prose.

JOHN BUXTON

REVIEWS

Beowulf. An Introduction to the Study of the Poem with a Discussion of the Stories of Offa and Finn. By R. W. CHAMBERS, with a Supplement by C. L. WRENN. Third Edition. Pp. xviii+628. Cambridge: University Press, 1959. 55s. net.

When Professor R. W. Chambers was preparing a second edition of his *Introduction to Beowulf* (first published in 1921), he was asked by the Cambridge University Press not to change the main text, since the plates had been stereotyped, but to bring the book up to date by inserting additional material in appropriate places. It was characteristic of the author, however, that he did insist on modifying the putative date of that disastrous raid by Hygelac or Chochilaicus on the Hetware or Atuarii, mentioned in historical writings by Gregory of Tours and others. 'The precise date is not given', he had stated (p. 3) in the first edition, 'but it must have been between A.D. 512 and 520.' In the second edition of 1932 he changed this to read (somewhat clumsily, in order to keep the type within the line): 'The precise date is not given, but it was after 515, probably after 520, but before 530.' It was also characteristic of Chambers's admirable conscientiousness as scholar and teacher that he obelized all those items in the bibliographies which he had not seen with his own eyes. These features are retained in Wrenn's third edition now under review.

I well remember how very dissatisfied Chambers himself was with the untidy proportions of his revised edition. Summaries of 'Recent Work on Beowulf to 1930' formed an additional Part V, which had to follow the original Appendix (Part IV). In all, the new material increased the size of the book by some 150 pages.

In preparing the third edition, after an interval more than twice as long as that between the first and the second, Professor Wrenn has deliberately chosen to follow a similar procedure. His simple aim has been 'to bring the work factually up to date' and to offer his readers a complete guide to every available source of knowledge, including all the latest Sutton Hoo findings. He has therefore added a fairly substantial Part VI (pp. 507-48), consisting of four exceedingly well-written and illuminating chapters on recent scholarship, and also a 'Supplementary Bibliography to 1958', which ends with an entirely new eleventh section on 'Sutton Hoo and Archaeology'. He has also followed Chambers's example by adding brief critical comments on certain books, giving some indication of their relative value and importance. In this, as in all other ways, he has loyally kept to the original pattern in every detail. He has extended the excellent Index by the late Miss Winifred Husbands by interpolating full references to the supplementary material. As a concession to economy, he has omitted the ten illustrative plates. This large book, as it now stands, is more than ever indispensable to every serious student of *Beowulf*.

Many notable studies have appeared in this last quarter-century. We have

only to think of J. R. R. Tolkien's British Academy Lecture on *Beowulf*, the *Monsters and the Critics*; J. C. Pope's *The Rhythm of Beowulf*; Kemp Malone's introduction to his Facsimile of the Thorkelin Transcripts; Dorothy White-lock's *The Audience of Beowulf*; Kenneth Sisam's essay on the compilation of the manuscript in *Studies in the History of Old English Literature*; and Neil Ker's expert description in his *Catalogue of Manuscripts containing Anglo-Saxon*. Curiously enough, no one has yet ventured to furnish textual critics with that essential tool—a complete concordance. Is the would-be compiler postponing achievement until scholars are better agreed on a *textus receptus*? Or is he just waiting for the appearance of Kemp Malone's Variorum Edition? In the meantime, we are well served by the accurate and comprehensive glossaries accompanying both Klaeber's edition and Else von Schaubert's revision of Heyne-Schücking.

The Supplementary Bibliography reveals an undiminished flow of essays, notes, and comments, concerned with both general criticism and textual exegesis. Indeed, their number seems to be increasing and their quality remains consistently high. Such an ancient and complex poem as *Beowulf* cannot, after all, be subjected to any final exposition. It must be continually re-created and reinterpreted from age to age.

SIMEON POTTER

The Paris Psalter. MS. Bibliothèque Nationale Fonds Latin 8824. Preface by various contributors collected by BERTRAM COLGRAVE. Pp. 20+188 (Early English Manuscripts in Facsimile 8). Copenhagen: Rosenkilde & Bagger; London: Allen & Unwin, 1958. £32.

The Paris Psalter Manuscript, important to the student of the Vulgate Latin text, of the Anglo-Saxon language, and of several aspects of the cultural developments from the Benedictine revival, is here reproduced with the usual efficiency of this noble series, and introduced by the usual distinguished and authoritative prefatory matter. The very tall and narrow folios with Latin and OE. texts parallel and the series of attractive and historically interesting pen-drawings inserted at gaps in the Latin of the first six folios give a special character to this work, in which the OE. prose rendering of the first fifty psalms may plausibly be regarded as derived from work done under the direction of King Alfred himself. The prefatory material too is unique because owing to an accident, Mr. John Bromwich, who had planned and should have carried out the whole editing, had to be replaced for most of it by a notable group of specialist scholars whose material the General Editor has arranged. Only the opening sections on the general history and description of the manuscript are derived directly from Mr. Bromwich. The handwriting is dealt with by Mr. Neil Ker, the decoration by Professor Wormald who also contributes the section on the Litany, and the Psalm texts are introduced by Dr. Sisam and Miss Celia Sisam.

The history of the manuscript, which first finds surviving mention in an inventory of books belonging to Jean Duc de Berry of 1402, has considerable interest; and the suggestion is offered by Mr. Bromwich that a more appropriate title

might be *The Bilingual Psalter in Latin and Old English of Jean Duc de Berry*. This voracious collector may have acquired the book during his stay as a hostage in England after the treaty of Bretigny. Some curiosity must remain unsatisfied by the reference (p. 13) to 'one chemically treated inscription' on one of the conjoint leaves of medieval parchment in front of the text. In his account of the handwriting Mr. Ker, with his usual scrupulous exactitude, adds the footnote (36): 'In my Catalogue of Manuscripts containing Anglo-Saxon, p. 440, I have said wrongly that f. 7 is in another hand'. In the section on the decoration, it is perhaps accidentally that Professor Wormald fails to tell us about the thirteenth pen-drawing on f. 6^r beyond noting the Latin text it illustrates. Had the artist of these drawings not abandoned his task after only a few folios, the Paris Psalter would indeed have been one of the most notable monuments of the eleventh century.

The handling of the Latin and OE. texts by the Sisams is done with remarkably blended brevity and effectiveness, and all essentials are included, unless possibly a little more might have been looked for on a conceivable relationship between the Latin ancestor of the Paris Psalter and the Latin of the Vespasian Psalter. The Alfredian origin of the archetype of the prose renderings, so strongly urged by Mr. Bromwich a few years ago, is here treated with proper caution though not entirely rejected.¹ A mid tenth-century date is suggested for the original of the metrical translations, though their metre is considered decadent. The wide importance of these versifyings is indicated, and the appearance of apparent extracts from such a metrical version in the Menologium and the Eadwine Psalter is well touched on. Perhaps a hasty reader might be misled by the statement (p. 16) that MS. Junius 121 'contains a prose Benedictine Office'. For though this work of Wulfstan, apparently based in part on Ælfric, is by a convenient traditional usage commonly referred to as *The Benedictine Office*, it is in fact not an Office, nor is it specifically Benedictine, nor is it in any way related to the OE. version of the Benedictine Rule. The so-called *Benedictine Office*, as Mr. Ure has lately reminded us, is rather an exposition and commentary on the Latin ritual apparently intended for non-monastic priests or *canonicas* in Wulfstan's time.² Mr. Ure's edition, nevertheless, is referred to in a footnote (66).

The prefatory matter concludes with a most useful table of contents of folios, so that the reader can instantly find in the facsimile any particular passage; and a full list of all books and articles referred to in it. Though not referred to in the text, the brief but valuable work of Glunz on the text of the Scriptures in Britain might have been added here.³

The reproduction of the manuscript is very well done. Its appearance should emphasize, as does the prefatory matter, the great importance of its Latin text, and perhaps encourage the publication of a complete edition with modern accuracy to replace Thorpe's unique version of the whole work now shown to be

¹ 'Who was the translator of the prose portion of the Paris Psalter?', in *The Early Cultures of North-West Europe (Chadwick Memorial Studies)* (Cambridge, 1950), pp. 289–303.

² *The Benedictine Office*, ed. James M. Ure (Edinburgh, 1957), pp. 62–63.

³ Hans Glunz: *Britannien und Bibeltext* (Leipzig, 1930).

far too free in its handling of the Latin. The mere layman may be puzzled by the seemingly very high prices found necessary in this series of facsimiles when he notices that a second edition of the Early English Text Society's facsimile of *Beowulf* has now appeared with new photography, at the price of 70s.

C. L. WRENN

Studies in Heroic Legend and in Current Speech. By KEMP MALONE. Edited by STEFÁN EINARSSON and NORMAN E. ELIASON. Pp. xx+298. Copenhagen: Rosenkilde and Bagger, 1959. Kr. 48.

Ten years ago, on his sixtieth birthday, Kemp Malone was presented with *Philologica: The Malone Anniversary Studies*, containing articles by a number of scholars. Now, on his seventieth birthday, his friends and colleagues have contributed towards the publication of a volume containing Malone's own work. The selection, which is his own, reflects two of his main interests: Germanic heroic legend, and the phonemic analysis of Modern English and Modern Icelandic.

The range of Professor Malone's published work on the first of these subjects is very wide indeed, and the task of selection must have been a difficult one. Taking the story of Ingeld as his principal theme, he has revised and combined three earlier articles, so that it is now possible to compare the story in its early stage in Old English poetry with all its later, much changed, manifestations in Scandinavian tradition: the various versions in *Saxo Grammaticus*, the *Hrólfs saga*, the *Bjarkarimur*, Arngrim Jónsson, and Snorri Sturluson. The combined evidence amply confirms Malone's original conclusion in 1930, that the exhaustive study of Old English sources is essential for all such problems of Scandinavian legend. In 'Agelmund and Lamicho' and 'Ecgtheow' the original story of the Hundings and Wulfings is treated in a similar way, this time with reference to Scandinavian, Old English, and Lombard traditions; in 'The Daughter of Healfdene' an expert knowledge of Scandinavian lore is used to restore *Beowulf*, line 62; and in 'Humblus and Lotherus' the reader is treated to a most revealing comparative genealogy, reconstructed from Danish, English, Gothic, and Icelandic sources.

Three of the articles present, in elaborated form, Malone's views on Theodric the Frank which are familiar to users of his editions of *Widsith* and *Deor*. To students nurtured on Chambers, Jiriczek, or Schneider, these views have usually come as a profound but salutary shock. Controversial they may be (many scholars still regard the question of the two Theodrics as an open one), but they have stood the test of time, and it is a tribute to the bold conception and scholarly acumen that produced them that no effective counter-arguments have hitherto been formulated.

There remain, naturally, certain points of detail in these articles that many will still find unacceptable. To take a single example, the interpretation of *bonne cwid . . . se ðe beah gesyhp* (*Beowulf*, l. 2041) as 'then he who fled speaks and says' presents difficulties of syntax, style, and spelling (a Middle English *sehp*

'says' is certainly no evidence for such a spelling in Old English). But, in general, the field is one that Malone has made peculiarly his own, and few can match his ability to combine the evidences of history and legend, place and personal names, and textual allusions both clear and obscure.

The change to phonemics in the last two articles is to an altogether different and more competitive field. The original article on the phonemes of English (1940) has considerable historical interest, since it was the first attempt at anything near a complete analysis of English phonemes.¹ This version is a revision, and it suggests that Malone is not persuaded by the large volume of work done on phonemics in the past two decades, since he has extended rather than modified his original views. His clearest rejection of current practice is in treating long vowels and most diphthongs as single units rather than combinations of two phonemes: for example, he uses the symbols *y* and *w* to denote [ai] and [au] in *bite* and *bout* respectively. But his arguments for this are spirited rather than comprehensive; his retention of /oi/ in *boy* as a combination of two phonemes seems strangely inconsistent, and he makes no reference to the criteria of structure and pattern-congruity that have, in the main, determined the views of his opponents.

Again, on the difficult problem of how far different intonation patterns should receive phonemic status, Malone is over-dogmatic. The question of 'levels' simply does not arise, and he regards all patterns as sufficiently covered by the three pause-markers /., ./, and /?/. But the problem is surely more complex than this. Even Bloomfield's basic system allowed a 'suspension-pitch' for cases of aposiopesis with rising intonation. To take Malone's example of *They are going home*. vs. *They are going home?*, we must add *They are going home*—(sc. so you had better hurry); the intonation used here is certainly not covered by mere pause (./.), and we are thus led back to ask whether all such intonations are not distinctive features in their own right.

Some other questionable points are:

(i) Words like *bait* and *boat* are analysed to contain simple vowels (/e/ and /o/) on the grounds that the off-glide is often lacking, and that 'in phonemic analysis non-distinctive features are isolated simply to be set aside'. This is reasonable, but by the same argument Malone's /x/ has no claim to phonemic status, since the sound [ç] in *hue*, *huge*, &c., is also often lacking, and may well be no more than a non-distinctive feature of the sequence /hj/.

(ii) The suggestion that the two sounds [ʃ] as in *thresher* and [ʒ] as in *treasure* may be 'allophones' of the same phoneme seems to stretch the sense of that term beyond its normal limits.

(iii) It is at least debatable whether the *o* of *choir* can be regarded as a direct orthographic representation of /w/, especially in view of the uncertain ancestry of this spelling.

Students of Germanic legend will perhaps regret that the volume could not

¹ The same claim may be made for Malone's article on the phonemes of Icelandic, but this does not fall for discussion here. Those interested may be referred to a full treatment by Einar Haugen in *Language*, xxxiv (1958), 55–88.

have been simply a corpus of Kemp Malone's writings on that subject. But it is, as it stands, a more fitting testimony to the breadth of his interests and his undoubted versatility.

M. L. SAMUELS

The South English Legendary. Edited by CHARLOTTE D'EVELYN and ANNA J. MILL. Vol. I, pp. xii+356; Vol. II, pp. vi+357-706; Vol. III, pp. xii+82 (Early English Text Society 235, 236, 244). London: Oxford University Press for the Society, 1956, 1956, 1959. 35s., 35s., 25s. net respectively.

This edition is concerned with the second of Wells's eight groups of manuscripts of *The South English Legendary*, now believed to be closer to the original composition than the earlier MS. Laud 108 which Horstmann printed in 1887 as *The Early South English Legendary*. That second group comprises four manuscripts: Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, 145, Harley 2277, Ashmole 43, and Cotton Julius D IX. The present editors originally proposed to edit Harley 2277, supplementing it from the Corpus manuscript, but when comparison of the manuscripts showed that 'the Corpus text was a somewhat more careful as well as a decidedly more complete text', they modified their plan accordingly. The edition is, then, mainly from the Corpus manuscript; about 4,000 lines from Harley are used to make good a deficiency in Corpus.

The stated intention of the editors has been 'to make available for further study the earliest orderly text of *The South English Legendary*' (Vol. I, p. v). It is, however, not very clear to this reviewer precisely how the terms 'earliest orderly' are to be understood. If they apply to the Corpus text, which the editors print, that is indeed now available, either in the body of these pages, or in the apparatus of variants at points where readings of Corpus have been rejected. But there are reasons for thinking that something else than the publication of Corpus was intended. For one thing, although it was decided to print Corpus, reference is made in the introduction (Vol. III, p. 3) to the 'importance of Harley 2277 as the earliest orderly text' of the *Legendary*. For another, the text printed from Corpus has been supplemented from Harley to an extent constituting a major, radical emendation. Corpus has, moreover, been subjected to many smaller emendations and supplementations. Apparently, then, some kind of reconstruction was intended.

The principles and methods by which this has been carried out are not clear, either from the introductory material in Volumes I and III, or from examination of the variant readings. The major emendations supplementing the Corpus text have already been noted. Various smaller emendations suggest that the editors have gone beyond emending only in order to make sense of the text or to remove obvious errors. Not infrequently they reject a reading of the 'basic' manuscript where this makes sense and is not obviously an error. At some other points, where the Corpus text passes muster, they allow its reading to stand in the face of equally acceptable variants in other manuscripts. Some emendations are evidently made on grounds of rhyme; others by argument from the context, or

from external information, or from *usus scribendi*; still others, apparently, because of majority attestation. Further, genetic considerations may be involved, since the editors in their foreword (Vol. I, p. v) refer to the Ashmole and Cotton manuscripts 'as representing as far as manuscript relations have been determined another "family" of the text'.

The question at once raises itself whether the four manuscripts consulted descend from an exclusive common ancestor. With this goes another, not strictly textual: whether the work in the form here reconstructed is held to be the product of a single act of composition, however sustained or shared, which was brought to completion before copies were multiplied, or whether it is viewed as the fullest surviving result of a process of accretion. The editorial position with respect to these questions is not made clear. Yet they are fundamental and must absolutely determine the practice of any editor in the strict sense of that term. If *The South English Legendary* is considered to be the product of a single act of composition, then all the manuscripts of the work must be descended from an archetypal copy. Recovery of that archetype may appear impossible for practical reasons connected with the character of the transmission. Then it will be desirable to know to what point in the transmission the Corpus manuscript is thought to have been corrected. An 'earliest' manuscript, it will be recalled, is not necessarily a 'best' manuscript. An 'orderly' manuscript will not at all necessarily have good individual readings. Corpus has been chosen as the 'basic' text. Is this term to be understood in its strict sense? Or is Corpus in fact regarded as the 'best' manuscript, invested with authority accordingly, and thereafter printed with minimal correction as restored to what the scribe would have written if he had made no errors of copying? If a single act of composition for the *Legendary* is assumed, have the editors attempted to restore the words then written as far as the evidence permits?

There are signs that the present work is thought of as an interim stage in the editing of *The South English Legendary*. The 'earliest orderly text' is to be made 'available for further study'; decisions about correctness (sc. originality?) when the manuscripts disagree are 'another problem, the problem of the critical text' (Vol. III, p. 15). In that case what is the user of this edition to make of emendations of the text of C where it is by no means obviously in error? The suggestion of an inconsistent practice is unavoidable. It is, no doubt, to some degree pardonable, in view of the nature of the editorial problem. But what a pity that the devoted labours of the editors were not made more useful by clearer definitions, of their principles, their methods, and the extent of their undertaking. As things are their work reflects confusion of the various editorial functions.

GEORGE KANE

Geoffrey Chaucer. Canterbury Tales. Edited by A. C. CAWLEY. Pp. xviii+612 (Everyman's Library 307). London: Dent, 1958. 10s. 6d. net.

Many who wish to 'read and understand Chaucer's own words' will welcome this edition of the *Canterbury Tales*. It presents in neat and inexpensive form the excellent text of Robinson's second edition (1957), with a glossary of single words

down the margin and translation of longer difficulties at the foot of the page. Professor Cawley has anticipated the ignorance of the common reader with much care and understanding, glossing all archaic words and phrases and even spellings that might be puzzling. Some glosses seem superfluous, but, as Mr. Cawley says (p. v), 'whenever they are not urgently needed they should be ignored; and even when the reader finds it necessary to consult them, he should at once return to Chaucer's own words'. Most of his interpretations are spirited and hit the nail nicely on the head. A few are off the mark. In the description of the Knight in the General Prologue, A 68, 'and though that he were worthy, he was wys', *worthy* is glossed 'brave', though the sense here is rather 'eminent', i.e. despite his distinction he was wise and did not throw his weight about, but behaved with modesty, 'as meeke as is a mayde'. *Vileynye*, A 70, is here not merely 'coarse language', but any offensive or slanderous remark unworthy of a gentleman. In the Knight's Tale, A 1648,

So ferden they in chaungyng of hir hewe,
As fer as everich of hem oother knewe,

Mr. Cawley's translation, . . . 'as soon as they saw each other', cannot be correct; the meaning seems to be rather, 'in so far as each knew well the quality of his opponent', i.e. the change of colour in their faces reflected their certainty that they were facing a mortal fight, like the Thracian hunter facing lion or bear. In the Prologue to the Cook's Tale, A 4326, 'For joye him thoughte he clawed him on the bak', the gloss is not helpful: 'clawed his back for joy'. This leaves *him thoughte* unexplained. A translation, 'because of the joy (which) it seemed to him, he clawed &c.', could not be justified. Presumably the literal sense is 'in his delight it seemed to him that the Reeve was scratching his back', i.e. scratching just where it itched, giving him the utmost pleasure, gratifying his senses (cf., O.E.D. under *claw*, v. 4 b). The idiomatic sense of 'claw the back', 'flatter', 'curry favour', does not seem relevant here. In the Wife of Bath's Tale, D 1069, *foule disparaged*, the verb has its primary sense; so, 'disgraced by an unequal match', rather than 'foully dishonoured'. The hag is of too 'lough a kynde' for the knight. In this Tale some of the most awkward passages to gloss are those that reproduce the argument of a Latin original, and the footnotes to D 1146-9 and 1161 offer paraphrase rather than accurate translation. The interpretation of D 1196 is incorrect: 'Poverte is . . . A ful greet bryngere out of bisynesse', i.e. 'an excellent thing for taking one out of the anxious bustle of the world' (translating *curarum remocio*), not 'a great incentive to work'. In the Canon's Yeoman's Tale, G 1009, 'If shame or los may causen any drede' is not 'if there is any fear of loss or shame', but 'if you fear (and wish to avoid) loss or shame', i.e. unless you cast out such Judases from your midst you will certainly suffer loss or shame.

Some errors are inherited from earlier editors. In the Miller's Tale, A 3715,

'Allas', quod Absolon, 'and weylawey,
That trewe love was evere so yvel biset!'

'yvel biset' is glossed 'ill bestowed' (as in Skeat's glossary), though this does not sound well from Absolon's lips at this point. The more natural interpretation,

'afflicted', 'badly used', is supported by examples cited by Kurath and Kuhn, *M.E.D.*, under *bisetten*, 5 (c). In the same Tale, A 3821, 'he foond neither to selle / Ne breed ne ale', means literally 'he found neither bread nor ale for sale', apparently translating a French idiom, *ne trouva point de pain à vendre*, which is cited by Skeat (notes), but mistranslated by him 'he found no bread to sell' (cf. *Cursor Mundi* 2399: 'Abram to sell moght find na sede'). Mr. Cawley's translation, 'he did not stop at all (*lit.* to sell bread or ale)', is not literally correct.

Two interpretations are current for the Reeve's Tale, A 3966, 'Hir thoughte that a lady sholde hire spare': (i) followed by Mr. Cawley, 'it seemed to her that ladies should respect her' (similar also Skeat and Robinson in their notes), and (ii) 'it seemed to her that a lady should be reserved' (cf. Donaldson, 'hold herself aloof'; Robinson, glossary, under *sparen*, reflex. 'be haughty', &c.). Neither sense of *spare* is found in *O.E.D.* The second interpretation seems to be the right one. 'A lady' is what the Miller's wife calls herself: by this interpretation the passage gains in primness and sarcasm.

There are many difficult lines in the *Canterbury Tales* which are not adequately explained in the standard editions of Skeat and Robinson. Mr. Cawley's thorough work of glossing the whole of this huge text not only solves difficulties but brings them to light. It will ease the reading of those who do not know Middle English, and sharpen the attention of those who do. For good measure he contributes also a brief but lively introduction, notes on grammar and versification, and an up-to-date select bibliography.

URSULA BROWN

Design in Chaucer's *Troilus*. By SANFORD B. MEECH. Pp. xii+530. Syracuse, N.Y.: University Press, 1959. \$10.00.

In this critical study of *Troilus and Criseyde* Professor Meech sets out to infer Chaucer's 'design' from a fresh examination of his handling of Boccaccio's *Filostrato*. His method, as he says, is 'close textual analysis'; and in four long chapters he presents the results of a minute and, one imagines, prolonged study of the two texts. The first chapter (136 pp.) makes a preliminary survey, working through the two poems together, scene by scene; the second (100 pp.) compares them in their presentation of physical particulars of character and setting, and in their handling of time and the supernatural; the third (118 pp., much expanded from a paper already published in *English Institute Essays*, 1950) presents an exhaustive collation of the figurative material in English and Italian, arranged according to tenor, in seven 'areas'; the fourth (60 pp.) gives a synthetic account of the roles of the narrator and the principal actors, and ends with a summary comparison between the two poems. There are some ninety pages of notes.

I mention the page-totals because the first thing that strikes a reader of Mr. Meech's book is that it is too long. The author is determined, he says, to 'support generalization by proof'; but to do this he adopts a very laborious method of quoting his evidence, which involves, in particular, a notable excess of paraphrase. This, together with a tendency to summarize conclusions more frequently than

seems necessary in such a book, is likely to irritate some readers—particularly as the paraphrases themselves are rather repetitive, and, frequently, facetious ('Chaucer addresses his female constituency'; 'She kisses his eyes in return for a like attention to hers'). It should be said, however, that in his very full commentary Mr. Meech is able to bring a new wealth of detail to what are sometimes, in themselves, familiar points. His demonstration of the precision with which Chaucer marks the passage of time in his poem is convincing in this way; and so is his discussion of the social and topographical detail which distinguishes Chaucer's *Troy* from Boccaccio's. His remarks on the latter topic, in fact, are particularly good. He points out how Chaucer fills the 'social vacuum' which Boccaccio had left in his poem, and how, in doing so, he at once elevates his main characters—especially Criseyde—to a public eminence proper to the protagonists of high courtly romance, and at the same time prepares for the 'quasi-comic situations' which the fear of publicity forces on them in the second and third books. Observations like this lend weight to the author's final paragraphs, where he argues that the distinctive design of *Troilus* is to be found in a system of ironic contrasts and oppositions.

I think, however, that the main interest of the book for many readers will lie in the third chapter ('Figurative Associations in Seven Areas'), for here the author treats a topic which has been neglected by most other critics. Thus he analyses the figurative love-idiom of the English and Italian poems, and shows in great detail how the dynamic imagery of fire and assault which dominates Boccaccio's poem is subordinated by Chaucer to a group of images drawn from the twin hierarchies of society and church, with the result that 'the impression of order on all levels of being is relatively stronger in adaptation than in source; and the impression of stark violence, relatively weaker'. Again, his collection of images of physical living from the two poems illustrates well the tactile and muscular quality which is one of the distinguishing features of Chaucer's idiom—Criseyde variously 'winding', 'casting', 'rolling', and 'folding' ideas in her mind, for example (p. 309). Mr. Meech has done a service by collecting this material, and presenting it as fully as he does.

On the other hand, this chapter, like other parts of the book, suffers from weaknesses of critical method. The author is, admirably, determined to 'consider the poem for itself', and to ignore anything which is not relevant to this purpose; but his judgement of what is relevant and what is not seems to me questionable. In this chapter, for example, he devotes all his space to rather mechanical classified comparisons between *Troilus* and the *Filostrato*, without, even implicitly, relating Chaucer's figurative usage to its context in native literature and speech. This particular omission distorts his analysis at several points (as when he interprets proverbial figures in Chaucer as evidence of naïve sententiousness in the speaker who uses them), and could surely have been made good in such a spacious book. As it is, this chapter is impoverished by its more or less exclusive preoccupation with the immediate literary source, and by the inflexibility of critical approach which this imposes on the author. Here, and elsewhere, Mr. Meech collects much interesting material; but his methods of presentation and analysis do it less than justice.

The book is elegantly produced, and has few substantial slips or misprints, though whole lines occasionally go astray—three times in the notes (pp. 441, 469, and 483), and once, very misleadingly, in the text (p. 80). Unfortunately the notes (many of them simply line-references) are put at the back of the book, to which one section of thirty-six pages refers the reader 324 times.

JOHN BURROW

The Medieval Theatre in the Round. By RICHARD SOUTHERN. Pp. xviii+240. London: Faber and Faber, 1957. 45s. net.

The Medieval Theatre in the Round is so original that not just the book itself, but its reception too, ought to be reviewed. My impression is that the originality of Dr. Southern's method has not received the attention it merits, whereas some of his findings are being too readily accepted. Some of the findings are, of course, convincing, like his reconstruction of 'a scaffold hye' with its curtains; but others are open to question.

Dr. Southern's starting-point is *The Castle of Perseverance*. According to his reinterpretation of the famous plan, the function of the surrounding ditch or barrier was not to separate audience and actors, but to keep out those who had not paid to see the performance; both audience and actors were within the enclosure. Part of the audience would be accommodated around the inner side of the barrier; or, where a ditch was dug, on banking made from the spoil, which would be thrown on the inner side. The rest of the audience would be on the central 'place' or *platea*. The task of the 'stytelerys' was to keep this part of the audience from encroaching on the acting areas. These areas were the castle itself and the ground immediately round about it; the scaffolds, which were set round the inner side of the barrier or on the banking; and lanes kept open through the audience, which connected the castle with the entrance to the amphitheatre.

As has been generally appreciated, this conception promises exciting theatre; but that does not make it historically correct. Dr. Southern brings forward no convincing evidence to show that part of the audience was on the *platea*. The St. Apollonia miniature, which he uses brilliantly in his reconstruction of the scaffolds and of their position in relation to the audience, shows a *platea* quite clear of spectators. Again, to taking the ditch as an outer boundary there is the objection that it is shown in the plan as being within the ring of scaffolds; and even if one agrees with Dr. Southern that the names of the scaffolds may have been written outside the ditch because the draughtsman had not left himself room for them within it, there is the further objection that the only other reference to anything like a ditch, in *The Thrie Estaitis*, suggests a boundary, not to the theatre, but to the acting area. Nor does 'the hill' in *The Thrie Estaitis* provide satisfactory evidence for the existence of banking; it may well have been a natural feature.

From his detailed study of *The Castle of Perseverance* Dr. Southern passes on to a general account of medieval staging. He is no doubt right to direct our

attention to the rather neglected standing plays; but he seems to go too far when he puts all stationary presentation into the mould of *The Castle of Perseverance*; and when he insists that the *platea* was never a platform—he does not discuss the Coventry 'for pagone', which sounds like an apron stage.

Dr. Southern, then, has put forward a number of promising new ideas on medieval staging, but further investigation is needed before they can be regarded as established. There can be no doubt, however, about the soundness of the method which he employs in his study of *The Castle of Perseverance*. It is best described in his own words: 'The study of the theatre has been too often restricted to the examination of ideas in the head. To picture them on paper, or to analyse pictorial evidence about them, is a valuable corrective that too frequently is overlooked—and even sometimes pronounced bad scholarship. Practice of course is the ideal test' (p. 124). This theatrical and practical approach enables Dr. Southern to recover the actors' moves and business, and to reveal (with the help of Dr. James Willis on the linguistic side) the inadequacies of the stage directions in the E.E.T.S. edition of the play. We recognize that the editor of a dramatic text should have a knowledge of the practice of scriptorium or printing house; Dr. Southern has now demonstrated that a practical knowledge of the theatre is equally desirable.

J. F. ARNOTT

Humanism and Poetry in the Early Tudor Period. By H. A. MASON. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1959. Pp. viii + 296. 32s. net.

Mr. Mason's presentation of humanism in England in the sixteenth century would be more convincing if it did not presuppose that other scholars in the field must necessarily be wrong. His claim that Chambers's portrait of More is false (p. 37) is merely fatuous. Quoting Chambers's often cited opinion that

The virtues of Heathen Utopia show up by contrast the vices of Christian Europe. But the Four Cardinal Virtues are subsidiary to, not a substitute for, the Christian virtues. More has done his best to make this clear.

Mr. Mason maintains that if More had really wanted to make this point he might have let Raphael say that those of the Utopians who embraced Christianity came to see that the ideal republic fell seriously short of the orthodox Catholic ideal (p. 127). But if More had put his foot in it so clumsily, where would have been the wit which Mr. Mason so rightly stresses? In point of fact the hints he is asking for are to be found in *Utopia*, the most obvious being the distinction made between the 'vngentle and sharpe' law of Moses (*inclemens et aspera*) and 'the newe lawe of clemencie and mercie' (*clementiae*).¹ Hythloday is arguing against capital punishment, which, incidentally, the Utopians retain, but which is forbidden in the 'newe lawe of clemencie and mercie'. It is entirely consistent with More's method that this hint should be given in Book I, which was written later and contains the key to the interpretation of Book II. This, in More's view, is

¹ *Utopia*, ed. Lupton, pp. 62–63. I have drawn attention to this passage in my *Introduction to Utopia* (Uppsala, 1945), p. 77.

exactly what constituted the difference between the world before the advent of Christianity and the new revelation. When the Utopians draw on religion to enforce their morality, it is a religion 'quae grauis et seuera est fereque tristis et rigida'.¹ And when some of them embrace Christianity it is not necessarily as a revealed religion, but largely because 'they harde vs saye that Christ approved of a community of living among his followers; and that the same communitie dothe yet remaine amongst the rightest Christian companies'.² Mr. Mason's refusal to distinguish between natural and revealed religion, natural and divine law, makes nonsense of his arguments. Yet some of the sources he himself invokes indicate how fundamental the distinction was to the thinking of the period. John Fisher of Rochester in his *Treatyse Concernyng . . . the Seuen Penytentiall Psalms*, quoted by Mr. Mason in a different connexion (pp. 208-9), makes the case quite clear:

Of a trouth the lawe gyuen to the Iewes was very ferefull and cruell, for that cause named the lawe of fere and deth. But now all suche seremonyes, ferefulnes, subgeccyons, and cruelte ordeyned for brekyng of it be past and done. As saynt Poule sayth a newe lawe is made and publysshed which is the lawe of lyberte and grace, and the lawe of lyfe and mercy.³

This was exactly what More's and Erasmus's friend and teacher John Colet had taught.⁴ In *Utopia* More describes a society governed by a law as 'ungentle and sharpe', the breaking of which means death or bondage. In spite of this handicap the Utopians often manage to equal and even surpass contemporary Europeans because these, so far from living according to the law of Christ, would not even allow themselves to be ruled by reason. Chambers is explicit on this point when quoting 'Reason is servant to Faith, not enemy',⁵ and Mr. Mason's statement that 'the heathen and Christian elements are not opposed . . . but held together' is in complete accordance with Chambers's view and not contrary to it, as he would have it (p. 139; cf. p. 126). The distinction between divine, natural, and man-made law is clearly set out in the opening pages of the *Dialogue between the Doctor and Student*, written by one of More's later opponents, Christopher Saint-German.

Nobody would deny that our knowledge of *Utopia* has been notably enriched by the contributions of Professor Hexter and Father Surtz, but this does not mean that Chambers must be discarded. Mr. Mason's argument is marred by the narrowness of his aim where an attack on a wider front would have revealed the strength of Chambers's position, supported now by the full weight of Father Surtz's documentation.⁶ Some of Mr. Mason's assertions are highly dubious, as, for instance, when he attempts to see *Utopia* as a dramatization of a conflict

¹ Lupton, p. 188.

² Ibid., pp. 268-9. I correct Robinson's translation according to Lupton's suggestion.

³ *The English Works of John Fisher*, ed. John E. B. Mayor (E.E.T.S., 1876, repr. 1935), p. 219.

⁴ Letter to Radulphus, quoted by Lupton, p. 62, n. 2.

⁵ Chambers, *Thomas More* (London, 1935), p. 128.

⁶ E. L. Surtz, S.J., *The Praise of Wisdom* (Chicago, 1957); *The Praise of Pleasure* (Cambridge, Mass., 1957).

in More's mind between 'his love of pleasure and his love of an ascetic life' (p. 129; cf. p. 103). The latter is well documented, but where is the evidence for his love of pleasure, unless it be in intellectual pursuits and the life of the spirit?

Mr. Mason's arguments are often disconnected and lacking in precision.¹ This is a pity, for he has something to say. His plea for human values in the Prologue is welcome and timely, and his attempt to see the humanist movement as one whole commands respect. Working on a hint of Huizinga to the effect that the formulas and ceremonies of the Middle Ages survived during the Renaissance, though bereft of all content, he finds humanism alive only at those moments when it was capable of substituting simplicity of faith and manners for empty symbols and vain ceremony, the outcome of pride. This, no doubt, was part of More's message in *Utopia*, and Mr. Mason does well to draw on Erasmus's *Convivium religiosum* for illustration, but it is only part of an infinitely complex whole, and More's attack on pride strikes deeper. However, this fragment of More's thought undoubtedly constitutes a serviceable link with humanist poetry and Wyatt, with whom Mr. Mason is on the whole happier and whose real value he would seek, not in the courtly poetry, but in his version of the Penitential Psalms. His treatment of Surrey seems less convincing. He is certainly happiest of all with Vives whose heritage flourished in Ben Jonson and became precious to the admirers of Ben.

Mr. Mason rightly stresses the significance of the vernacular, but he underestimates the humanists' experiments in Latin composition and their interest in pure form and elegant expression, which is something quite different from the outworn symbols of the waning Middle Ages. Mr. Mason here is guilty of some confusion. Even the Latin writings fulfilled a purpose in developing that sense of form which was lacking in the Middle Ages and could only be conquered by discipline through imitation of the Classics. Yet it was the condition of any artistic achievement to come, whether in verse or prose, in one literary kind or another, be it original or the merest translation.

H. W. DONNER

The Works of Thomas Nashe. Edited by RONALD B. MCKERROW. Reprinted from the original edition with corrections and supplementary notes edited by F. P. WILSON. Vol. I, pp. xvi + 386; Vol. II, pp. vi + 398; Vol. III, pp. vi + 416; Vol. IV, pp. iv + 484; Vol. V, pp. xii + 370 + iv + 84. Oxford: Blackwell, 1958. £12. 12s. net.

There can be few who will need to have this great work, first published between 1904 and 1910, recommended to them. On the original editor's death, thirty years after the publication of the last volume, Sir Walter Greg wrote:

The wide range and representative character of Nashe's writings, the fullness of

¹ Surprisingly his book contains no reference to works where he might have found a semblance of support for some of his contentions, e.g. E. M. G. Routh, *Sir Thomas More and his Friends* (Oxford, 1934), and the late Algernon Cecil, *A Portrait of Thomas More* (London, 1937).

the annotation, and the excellence of the index combine to make the edition one of the most useful books of reference that the student of Elizabethan literature can have. (*Proc. Brit. Acad.*, xxvi (1940), 502)

As Greg pointed out, the text is notable for its accuracy and the record of variants, and McKerrow here set a new standard in editorial method for English works. The commentary is the fruit of wide reading both in English and in classical and renaissance Latin works; with no earlier annotated editions to draw upon he rarely failed to explain, or to find parallels for, Nashe's many obscure references and allusions. The introduction is, of its kind, brilliant. Through the magnificent index (150 pages long) he made his findings easily accessible to others, and aided the study of Nashe's language and style by including in it not only the obsolete, but also anything uncommon, in word, form, or expression.

A complete revision of McKerrow's six years' labour would have been a long task. Those who have tried in vain to obtain the work (only 750 copies were printed of the original edition) will be glad that Professor Wilson has followed the shorter course of adding a supplement of eighty pages, which follows volume by volume the plan of the original. This ably summarizes, and gives references to, all the later printed Nashe studies of importance, and conveniently incorporates McKerrow's addenda to the later volumes. The inclusion of previously unprinted contributions from Mr. Wilson and other scholars who have collaborated with him, together with notes which McKerrow made in his own copy of his edition, makes the supplement a valuable addition to the original work.

Comment must be restricted mainly to the material that appears in print for the first time here.

There is an important addition to the scanty facts known about Nashe's life (p. 74). McKerrow had already inferred that the tradition that Nashe wrote for the bishops in the Marprelate controversy was sound; it now appears that he was on sufficiently close terms with Archbishop Whitgift himself to be referred to as 'his Nash gentleman', and may have been a member of the archbishop's household.

A correction may here be made to one of the first contemporary references to *Pierce Penilesse his Supplication to the Diuell*, which is found in a letter to Lord Burghley written by Robert Beale, Clerk of the Queen's Council and a moderate Puritan. McKerrow (v. 142) printed it from Strype's *Life of Whitgift*, where it appears among events of 1592, and remarked that it was not exactly dated. This is an oversight, since the manuscript of the letter, as Strype clearly states, bears the date March 17, 1592/3 (MS. Lansdowne 73, 4-13). Beale had attacked the Anglican discipline in the Commons, and the Queen in anger ordered him to absent himself from the court and parliament (J. E. Neale, *Elizabeth I and her Parliaments 1584-1601* (London, 1957), pp. 245 and 277). His letter points out, amongst other things, that the expression of Puritan opinion has been stifled, while the supporters of the bishops have free rein: 'it is an easye thinge, to fighte with men whose handes be bounde, and by printe and speeche to incense what they list, when others haue not the lyke libertie.' A few lines below, Beale refers to Nashe, evidently as one who attacked by print (Strype, followed by McKerrow, read *One of these subjects*):

One of these libellers in his booke intituled *A Supplication to the Diuell* so reuylethe the whole nation of *Denmarke* as eueryone that bearithe any due respect to her maiestie and her good friendes, maye be sorrye and ashamed to see it.

In this connexion more weight might have been given (as by Professor C. S. Lewis, *English Literature in the Sixteenth Century* (Oxford, 1954), p. 409) to the stylistic and other arguments that *An Almond for a Parrot*, which McKerrow classed as a doubtful work, is one of Nashe's contributions to the Marprelate controversy. McKerrow's principal reason for excluding it from the canon can be shown to lack cogency, and the positive evidence for Nashe's authorship has been steadily accumulating (see D. J. McGinn, *P.M.L.A.*, l ix (1944), 952-84; and Philip Drew, *N. & Q.*, ccv (1960), 216-17). The language also tallies. *An Almond* uses *took* and *mistaken* as past participles of the verbs *take* and *mistake*, but only after the auxiliary verb *have*. In over fifty examples of *take* and its compounds scattered throughout Nashe's works, *took* and *tooken* (once) regularly appear after *have*, and *taken* elsewhere (*have taken* occurs twice, *were took* once). These new and more colloquial forms, which are common in later literature, are unusual enough in a prose work printed in 1589 to be of value in determining the author. To take examples close in style to *An Almond*: the Marprelate tracts and those works certainly not by Nashe which answered them—the *Pasquil* tracts, *Pap with an Hatchet*, and *Martin's Month's Mind*—always use *taken*. Less individual, though supporting, points of correspondence are that Nashe and *An Almond* regularly use *amongst* and *betwixt* where the other tracts (except the last) have *among* and *between*.

There are many additions of all kinds to the commentary: for instance, *Monsieur Mingo* is the subject of two notes (pp. 12 and 64 f.) which throw new light on this obscure figure; the reference to the *browne bill and the long bowe* is traced to its origin in an odd claim to their superiority over the musket and caliver (p. 56); the controversy over Nashe's alleged reference to Kyd is judiciously summed up (pp. 67-68); and a linguistic note adduces more examples of the irregular formation *conswapped* (p. 45). Nashe's use of proverbial expressions is frequently noted, and some of these antedate or supplement Tilley and *O.D.E.P.* New sources are traced; in particular, extensive borrowings from Lodowick Lloyd's *The Pilgrimage of Princes* and Henry Howard's *Defensative against the Poison of Supposed Prophecies*.

There are several new early allusions to Nashe, one of which confirms his authorship of the *Choice of Valentines*. May there not be another reference to the poem in Harvey's description of Pierce Penilesse (i.e. Nashe) as 'the Deuils Orator by profession, and his Dames Poet by practise' (McKerrow, v. 62; my italics)? The Devil's Dam was an appropriate enough title for the courtesan Nashe is celebrating (cf. *The Comedy of Errors*, iv. iii. 46), and Harvey knew of Nashe's obscene verses.

There are useful additions to the bibliographical data. Thus the early issues of *Strange Newes* have been reclassified, and a new appendix on copies of the early editions traces the movements and present location of those known to McKerrow, and adds a large number not recorded by him, by *S.T.C.*, or by

W. W. Bishop. But the Pepys library copy of *Summer's Last Will and Testament*, which McKerrow had already recorded, is erroneously entered a second time in the Supplement, and presumably this is true of the John Rylands copy of *The First Part of Pasquil's Apology* also.

Despite the limitations imposed by a photolithographic reprint, the *errata* of the original edition and others noted by Mr. Wilson have been corrected, where possible, in the text. Some twenty-three lines of text or margin have been altered in this way; longer additions, and some of McKerrow's second thoughts, particularly when he abandoned his own conjectural reading to return to the copy-text, have still to be found in the notes. By an oversight the footnote on l. 23 in vol. iii. 107 has not been deleted; and a small error appears in the margin of vol. i. 174, where, if McKerrow's *erratum* is correct, it should be noted that the new reading *mans* is that of 92a, whereas 92c, the copy-text, reads *a mans*.

Professor Wilson has earned the gratitude of English scholars in making this new and improved edition available so quickly.

C. G. HARLOW

Act Division in Elizabethan and Jacobean Plays 1583-1616. By WILFRED T. JEWKES. Pp. x+374. Hamden, Conn.: Shoe String Press, 1958. \$6.50.

An examination of the original texts of the 236 printed plays which survive from the period 1583-1616 yields statistics on the strength of which Mr. Jewkes generalizes interestingly about the familiar departments of the theatre. The University Wits divided their plays into acts, as a rule, but 'adaptation for the stage resulted in either the total or partial loss of act headings' (p. 97); after 1616, the year of Jonson's Folio, division became the habit, a gradual change of practice in this direction beginning, in public theatre texts, around 1607 (p. 100); while private theatre dramatists commonly marked divisions throughout the whole period (p. 99).

Although Mr. Jewkes refuses to dogmatize, his most controversial conclusion presses the evidence too far. To contend that, of the seventy-four (?) plays for the adult companies surviving from 1591-1607, 'not a single one . . . is divided, except the five by Jonson' (p. 98) is to resort to rather questionable literalism. Because the act division is muddled, *Henry V*, we are told, 'was envisaged by Shakespeare as divided into five sections' (p. 175)—not acts! Manuscript plots and plays, though surely more pertinent than printed books, are brushed aside: evidence of act markings in plots is said to be 'practically non-existent' (p. 8). Yet of the five known and fairly undamaged plots from the period as many as four, all from the public theatres, exhibit a clear five-part division, whether through directions for Music, Presenter and Dumb Show, or Chorus: therefore a five-section structure must have been obvious in performance, as Greg noted long ago (*Dramatic Documents* (1931), p. 80. In two of the four, *Dead Man's Fortune* and *I Tamar Cam*, the division may just possibly belong to a later date.) A lost play, again, fails to qualify for Mr. Jewkes's statistics from printed texts, and yet

I think it relevant to his discussion that Chapman delivered two, and later three, *acts* ('ectes', 'ackes') to Henslowe, almost certainly for public theatre production (Henslowe's Diary, ff. 51^v, 52^v). Such awkward facts Mr. Jewkes huddles away as quickly as may be, not always without cogent explanations (cf. p. 46); if only he would have lined them all up together in one place, recognizing their combined menace to his own position, his readers would follow him more happily elsewhere.

'External' evidence for act division must be sought not only in explicit notations in the texts. Mr. Jewkes wonders (p. 69) why, of all Middleton's plays, only *The Phoenix* remained undivided. Yet such an exit-line as 'That Act endes nobly, preserues Ladies fames.' (sig. E 3b), and a direction such as 'Toward the close of the musicke the Iustices three men prepare for a robberie.' (sig. F3a) may indicate that in some state of the play act division was contemplated. Again, lines across the page, as found in the *Pericles* quarto, ought not to be passed over in silence, especially when they occur where we now close an act for other good reasons.

One regrets that, having grappled with the external evidence, and cleared up some dangerous misconceptions, Mr. Jewkes makes no attempt to come to terms with the internal, dismissing the methods of Bradley and Baldwin as 'unrewarding and misleading' (p. 4). Their theories of a five-movement structure in Shakespeare's plays conflict with his: they deserved a more detailed consideration. After all, what is the point of literary statistics about structure if the 'movement' of plays such as Shakespeare's is not illuminated in the process?

E. A. J. HONIGMANN

The Sonnets of William Alabaster. Edited by G. M. STORY and HELEN GARDNER. Pp. liv+65 (Oxford English Monographs). Oxford: University Press, 1959. 18s. net.

Alabaster's first editors justify what might seem their quixotic championing of a dim recusant poetaster with the claim that Alabaster, writing around 1597-8, is interesting as an immediate forerunner of the 'metaphysical' school of religious poets, particularly Donne. And he is so, they argue, in several related ways. With Constable, Barnes, and Lok, just before him, he uses the Petrarchan sonnet form for devotional purposes. As a Catholic convert poet, he puts the current Ignatian techniques of spiritual exercise in the service of the formal, and traditional, meditation. Above all, he is himself an early example of the 'metaphysical' writer, and some if not all of these sonnets are 'metaphysical' poems, different in kind from earlier work. The attractiveness of this case is that it shows a level-headed endeavour to place Donne in relation to the developing techniques and stylistic features of his day. Its weakness, as it is presented here, is that it is not nearly specific enough. In what way is Alabaster 'metaphysical', as the General Introduction frequently asserts him to be? The reader who is dissatisfied with conventional generalities about the 'dialectical teasing of his subject' is left to infer this for himself, as well as the editors' own view of what is

to be understood by that most slippery of critical terms in reference to Donne and his followers. A footnote suggestion that our concern here is with the nature of the poetic experience is not taken up in the account of Alabaster's poetry, nor is it easy to see its pertinence to such insipid stuff. Otherwise, one gathers from descriptive uses of the term that Alabaster is 'metaphysical' because (a) of the kind of figures he used, and the fields from which he drew them, (b) of his manner of using figures, (c) of a recurrent toughness, obscurity, compression, in the poetic statement.

The basis of Alabaster's poetic method, not essentially different from that of his secular predecessors and contemporaries, is the ingenious exploitation of the conceit; and this, at its simplest, means the description of one's own situation entirely in terms of, or parallel with, another situation seemingly quite remote from it. The conceited manner of writing, as English poets developed it from Petrarch, threw prime emphasis on the wit with which correspondences were found or made, and it produced a crop of such regular witty features and movements as the adroitly interpreted emblem, the paradox, and the unexpected final twist. The construction of a sonnet became a running struggle to exploit one's chosen conceit wittily—that is, at the least, to fit it ingeniously and coherently to one of the conventional situations of love—within the formal limits; and it is this, in his different sphere, which Alabaster commonly fails to do. The first reason for his poetic miscarriage, as for his obscurity, is that he can rarely match conceit to form. Usually the concealed play proves intransigent, and he can contain it only at the expense of rhythm and coherence alike, or he cannot communicate it intelligibly at all. Less frequently, it is too easily disposed of, and he pads. Very occasionally he is lucky, the jostling elements accord and subside, and he writes for a moment competently and even movingly, suggesting Herbert. Nor, when he falls down here, does he offer much in compensation. All is staked on the wit; and lacking vitality of image, cadence, and rhythm, he seldom achieves more than a flat—if fairly dense—imbroglio of some prescriptive gloss or credal paradox. The patterned grace of his witty predecessors has been abandoned, and the dynamic splendour of his witty successor not achieved. There is a promise of the kind of psychological interest sometimes claimed for 'metaphysical' writers in the postulation on the jacket that these sonnets were written 'under the stress of a recent conversion and in expectation of martyrdom'. But for all the ferment suggested by a career of frantic vacillation between Anglican Orders and Rome, the man does not emerge in the writing, imaginative pressure is quite lacking, and in bulk Alabaster's work is intolerably tedious.

What then is Alabaster's place? He is interesting as exhibiting the counter-reforming tendency, which also touched Donne, to exploit secular materials and manners for pious ends—to 'reliify' Petrarch, as it were. Like Donne, he employs in a witty way, to the proper end of arousing devotion, the Ignatian method of meditation on specific features of Christ's Passion and other scriptural episodes: quite as in the secular play of conceit, the task is the pointing by means chiefly emblematic of significant correspondences between the event meditated on and the poet's own predicament. He goes beyond his predecessors, secular

and pious alike, in his concentration on the ingenuity of the conceit and utter unconcern with grace or smoothness; though not very far beyond, say, the *Zephelia* poet, who is often more fantastically ingenious and not much less rough and concentrated. In subtlety he is pre-eminent, as the editors meticulously demonstrate; but it is the undramatic subtlety of complex allusion to traditional scriptural glosses and doctrinal refinements. His image field brings him closer to Donne and Herbert. While scraps of remote lore were gaining currency in the sequences of the 1590's, Alabaster more nearly anticipates the seventeenth century in his intricate handling of such devices as the emblematic ring or circle, man as microcosm, Christ crucified as vine.

Thus the use of this edition is that it enables us to plot a crucial step in the development of English poetic wit, and, more specifically, to come nearer to bridging the gap between Sidney and Donne. Technically, Alabaster is rather nearer the acknowledged 'metaphysical' writers than witty poets previously available to us, and considerably nearer to them than any preceding English devotional sonneteer. What still separates him from Donne, quality apart, is the paucity of his witty armoury; and the decisive limitation is the absence from these sonnets of any attempt to exploit the polemical manners and resources of rhetoric.

One may hesitate over the lavishing of so much editorial industry, skill, and intelligence on so inconsiderable a poet; but it is an advantage to have Alabaster, and he is here most helpfully presented.

A. J. SMITH

The Poems of James VI of Scotland. Edited by JAMES CRAIGIE. Vol. II, pp. xlvi+318 (Scottish Text Society, 3rd Series 26). Edinburgh: Blackwood for the Society, 1958.

This volume completes the first collected edition of the poems of King James VI, which is indispensable to any literary historian who aims at giving a full account of the sonnet, occasional verse, political and social satire, epitaph, song, masque, and verse paraphrase or translation. From what he has left, King James's place at, or near, the head of important developments in these forms cannot be in doubt and, had he written more, his claims as a pioneer would have been less easy to overlook.

Apart from one brief series of six, he does not favour the sonnet-sequence. His sonnets are really occasional poems ranging in subject-matter from national events and the weather to complimentary addresses and literary criticism. He is among the first to adopt the form later made notable in Spenser's *Amoretti*. His *Epithalamion*, a wedding masque, shows him following his own *Reulis and Cautelis* and points, even if in outline, to much that was to come. In metrical paraphrases of the Psalms, he saw very clearly what ought to be done, and set himself to break with the monotony of the 'ballad' stanza which had become a tradition. As a metrist, he is surprisingly versatile, and in his rendering of thirty psalms employs almost as many stanza forms.

The 'Flyting' or diatribe of an earlier day becomes, in his 'Admonition to the

'Master Poet', a piece of sound, sententious advice given with whimsical good nature. This reappears in a mature form in his political and social verses, where his satire is without anger or bitterness or mockery. It is rather the tempered reproof of one persuaded that kings have wisdom and vision not vouchsafed to others:

Kings walke the milkye heavenly way
But you by bye pathes gad astray.

In his handling of the heroic and octosyllabic couplets in these last poems and in the new ease of a manner that approaches the familiar style, he stands on the threshold of a great age of controversial and satirical verse.

Ingenuity and the art of words were perhaps overstressed in his conception of poetry. It sprang from one side of his humanist training. 'Qui dominatur equis nunc dominatur acquis' is how he congratulates Buckingham on being made an Admiral of the Fleet. But, though he held that to be 'riche in quick inventions, and poetick floures, and in faire and pertinent comparisons' was the 'chief commendation' of a poem, his best work has other merits besides. Melodious lines are not infrequent, and, in the verses on the death of his queen, genuine, if restrained, feeling gives life to art and fancy:

Soe did my Queene from hence her court remoue
And left the earth to be inthron'd aboue.

His tributes to Sir Philip Sidney, to Montgomerie, to his faithful servant, John Shaw, the sonnets to the queen and on his voyage to Denmark disclose much that sets in a more attractive and a juster light a monarch who has not always been fortunate in his biographers.

A concise glossary, useful appendixes, and an index add to the value of this second volume. The notes are informative and scholarly. One matter, it may be observed, need no longer be in doubt. An entry in the manuscript records of the Presbytery of Edinburgh gives the date of the poet Montgomerie's burial as 22 August 1598.

The editor has carried out his exacting task with thoroughness and with judgement.

A. F. FALCONER

Thomas Middleton. By RICHARD HINDRY BARKER. Pp. xii+216. New York: Columbia University Press, 1958; London: Oxford University Press, 1959. 25s. net.

Middleton is, I take it, the most important English dramatist who has hitherto received no comprehensive monograph. It is a pity that the present one is not sounder and more substantial. The difficulties, of course, are very great. The first and most essential task is to establish the canon and chronology, or, where certainty is impossible, at least to set out the problems clearly. Mr. Barker reserves these matters for an appendix; and although this runs to over fifty pages,

it fails to present the relevant material adequately. For many plays it merely gives page-references to other authorities without indicating the nature of the problems. In other cases the reader will discover what the controversial matters are but not the evidence for views which differ from Mr. Barker's own. Two crucial examples will illustrate. *The Spanish Gipsy*, nowhere referred to in the body of the book, has a page and a half in the section 'Works attributed to Middleton'. Here Mr. Barker reviews previous opinion on the authorship, rejects the attribution to Middleton on stylistic grounds, giving three examples, and approves the claims of Ford. But he does not state, as do both G. E. Bentley and H. J. Oliver, whose views he disparages, that the quarto of 1653 ascribes the play to Middleton and Rowley. The *external* evidence of their authorship is thus the same as for *The Changeling* itself, though no one would guess it from this book. The discussion of *The Revenger's Tragedy*, here asserted on the strength of parallel passages to be Middleton's, does not acknowledge that many scholars still accept the traditional ascription to Tourneur. The note on the authorship refers only to an article of Mr. Barker's own; to the book on *Middleton's Tragedies* by Mr. Schoenbaum, who we are told was Mr. Barker's pupil; and to the late E. H. C. Oliphant, 'who first presented the case for Middleton'. An impartial scholar would have been likely to mention also at least the review of the problem by R. A. Foakes (*M.L.R.*, xlvi, 1953), which sums up in Tourneur's favour. Such selective and arbitrary use of evidence is characteristic and provides an unreliable foundation for the critical 'interpretation'.

In the body of the book scholars already well enough informed to make the necessary reservations will find Middleton's career tidily surveyed in its successive phases. But the critical examination of the plays does not go very deep. Plots and characters are gone over and give rise to comments like 'Realism could scarcely be carried much farther' (p. 46) or 'The cumulative effect is very impressive' (p. 74). Such judgements are often put in a tone appropriate to matters of fact. The author appears to take particular pleasure in dogmatic pronouncements when they go against received opinion: 'Though *Women beware Women* is not so well known as *The Changeling* . . . it is as a whole a far more perfect specimen of Middleton's art'; a final sentence announces that Middleton is, after Shakespeare and Jonson, 'the third great dramatist of the Jacobean stage'. Yet positiveness of this kind leaves room for doubts about the critic's perceptiveness. Mr. Barker says that the last scene of *The Changeling* (in which Beatrice is brought to the full recognition of her own deformity) 'adds nothing to the play but a little pointless violence'; and that in *A Trick to Catch the Old One* the character of Dampit (whom one might have taken to exhibit emblematically the doom of an 'old one') 'scarcely deserves a place in the play at all'.

HAROLD JENKINS

The Phonetic Writings of Robert Robinson. Edited by E. J. DOBSON. Pp. xxii+96 (Early English Text Society 238). London: Oxford University Press for the Society, 1957. 28s. net.

Robert Robinson was a very remarkable early phonetician. He was a man of great originality and independence of thought, an accurate observer and analyst of linguistic facts, and a consistent and careful transcriber into phonetic notation of the results of his analysis. He is also something of a mystery: nothing is known about his life, and his work for long suffered complete and undeserved neglect. His book, *The Art of Pronuntiation*, which was published in London in 1617, attracted no attention whatever for 300 years (there is now only one known copy, in the Bodleian). Extensive phonetic texts transcribed in his system of notation survive in manuscript (also in the Bodleian), but only recently were they recognized for what they are. Amendments are now made, however, and thanks to Dr. Dobson and the Early English Text Society the book and the phonetic texts are now readily available to all who are interested either in the development of English pronunciation or in the history of linguistic thought: for the former, Robinson provides copious evidence (sometimes not easy to interpret) on a number of points concerning the early seventeenth century, and for the latter he provides the first appearance of several items of modern phonetic doctrine (though since apparently nobody read him, his influence on the development of his subject wa: nil).

Robinson, unlike most other early writers on pronunciation, was neither an orthoepist nor a spelling reformer; his interest was in 'the naturall structure of the voice', and particularly in how one might 'learne the exact touch of pronuntiation of any forraine language whatsoeuer'. He was, perhaps, the first in Europe to see that here was a science (as he himself calls it) in its own right. We would find little to quarrel with today in his approach to the subject. A sound, which is 'the least part or member of the voice', is, he says, 'an accident effected by the opposition of these two contraries, namely motion and restraint: motion of the ayre out of the inward parts of the body, and restraint of it in its motion', and his classification of sounds is based on 'the places of restraint' and 'the manner of restraint'. He provides a particularly noteworthy diagram of tongue positions in illustration of 'the scale of vowels'. It must be admitted, however, that although Robinson claims to be dealing with all human speech sounds, his analysis is clearly based on English; it suffers, moreover, as Dr. Dobson has pointed out, from Robinson's liking for symmetrical systems. Nevertheless, it is a pity that the subject did not get off to the excellent start that Robinson, if he had been known, would have provided; his work, however open to criticism in detail, gives a framework which is all that could be desired.

For what purpose Robinson's phonetic transcriptions were made is not known. They consist mainly of some 900 lines of poetry, mostly by Richard Barnfield, and contain a wealth of interesting material. The phonetic notation in which they are written, however, is of Robinson's own invention and is not based on the roman alphabet (it is illustrated in the frontispiece of the present edition); and this presents an editor with a difficult problem, for he must decide whether it

should be transliterated. Like all such invented notations, this one, as Dr. Dobson says, is 'easier to forget than to learn and hard to read even when learnt', and not many people would be prepared to tackle the texts in their original form. But if it is decided to transliterate them into a form more easily apprehended, another difficulty arises. Robinson's notation is not, in the strict sense of the term, an *alphabetic* one; it is in some respects syllabic, reflecting the analysis on which it is based. This, of course, is not a defect, but one of Robinson's main claims to originality: it is in fact a striking anticipation of modern 'prosodic' analysis of the Firthian school. Briefly, Robinson treats the voiced-voiceless distinction as a property of the syllable, and not of the individual sound; he takes, moreover, voicelessness and not voice as the positive feature. The symbols for the sounds do not in themselves, therefore, carry any implications of voicing, but a diacritic placed at the beginning of the syllable indicates if voicelessness occurs in it and at what point. Robinson's notation has thus two *orders* of symbols where alphabetic writing has one, and a strict transliteration must somehow preserve this. Dr. Dobson, admittedly faced with a very difficult problem, has provided what is rather a 'translation' into alphabetic terms than a transliteration, and Robinson's thought is distorted by it to an extent which the reader may not realize unless he has studied the original carefully. Robinson's 'prosodic' approach is completely disguised.

More difficult to excuse is Dr. Dobson's method of transliterating the vowels. Robinson has ten different vowel symbols, representing sounds 'every one of different quality'. True, five of them are described as short and five as long, but in the notation itself there is no indication of length, and it would have been best to represent them in the transliteration by ten different symbols. Dr. Dobson has chosen to use five different symbols, each with and without a length-mark, and in so doing seriously misrepresents Robinson's system of notation. (Dobson may have been inclined towards this choice by a misunderstanding, which he reveals in his introduction, of the nature of the I.P.A. alphabet, which would have provided him with ten very convenient symbols for transliterating the vowels. I.P.A. symbols have often been used for transliteration, and do not commit to precise phonetic values, as Dobson seems to imagine.) A final criticism is that the reader should certainly have been provided with a table showing the correspondences between Robinson's symbols and those chosen by Dr. Dobson to transliterate them.

Given the above criticisms, one cannot praise too highly the care with which this edition has been prepared, and the painstaking labour which must have gone into the transliteration and into ensuring the accuracy of its reproduction, and also into compiling the very valuable word index.

DAVID ABERCROMBIE

Milton and This Pendant World. By GEORGE WESLEY WHITING. Pp. xviii+264. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1958. \$5.00.

This book is offered as a 'study of Milton's poetry and the religious tradition'. Its purpose is 'to interpret Milton in an age increasingly sceptical, in a culture

dominated by the assumptions of the natural and historical sciences, and by the illusions of progress and enlightenment', and with that end in view 'to trace' in relation to Milton's use of them 'the course of certain ideas, symbols, and themes' in Christian and particularly Protestant tradition—e.g. the keys and the sword of *Lycidas*, 110, 130, the mysterious stairs of *P.L.*, iii. 510 ff., and the several 'ages' of the world (*P.L.*, xi, xii). It takes its stand on twin theses of very different critical worth: (1) that to respond aright to Milton's poetry it is necessary to possess or cultivate sympathetic understanding of Christian doctrine and tradition, and (2) that Milton's poems, being of 'permanent spiritual and moral value', may exert an effective influence on the present state of society, which so manifestly needs 'a genuine spiritual and religious renaissance'. Milton is 'the peerless Christian poet and true humanist, from whose exalted seat are heard only the oracles of virtue and of God'; and it is Professor Whiting's earnest hope

that the voice and the message of Milton as here interpreted, echoing out of the distant past across the tumult of human hopes and fears, will even now to alien ears speak of things invisible to mortal sight and once more reveal how we may so pass through things temporal that we finally lose not the things eternal.

Deeply as one may share Mr. Whiting's concern over the spiritual problems of our time, and his reverence for Milton's teaching, it is difficult to approve the plan of the work, which subordinates the intrinsic worth of his literary researches to his missionary purpose. So presented, the themes of the component studies seem remote and out of place. (Who will be won over to Milton or to virtue by considering how the symbol of Jacob's ladder has at various times been interpreted?) Nor have they been chosen to mark successive stages in a coherent argument, for they are not logically consecutive or structurally related. Each essay represents a fresh start, assuming nothing that has gone before; and the book remains a collection of independent papers repetitive rather than progressive in effect as far as the enveloping theme is concerned.

Regarded as extended historical notes on a handful of traditional symbols, however, they are full of interest. The associational value of some of the passages involved has not been explored at all so exhaustively before. One essay stands apart from the rest—'*Comus*, Jonson, and the Critics'. This contains much sound commentary on *Comus* criticism from Thomas Warton to R. M. Adams; but its leading contention, set forth with varying degrees of conviction, is very difficult to accept—that 'part of Milton's masque was written as the converse of' and 'perhaps a rejoinder to' Jonson's *Hymenæi*. Such points of correspondence or contrast as can be adduced are due to a common fund of classical learning and a common preoccupation (though dictated by contrary motives) with the theme of virginity.

Mr. Whiting justly prides himself on the thoroughness of his documentation. Indeed it is sometimes over-full. In studying the marginal commentaries of the Geneva Bible in relation to *Paradise Lost* it scarcely needed twenty-eight pages of correspondences to prove that

It is at least possible that the Geneva Bible played an important part in fostering the spirit and the character, the climate of religious opinion, which shaped Milton's life and attained full poetic flowering in *Paradise Lost*.

Occasionally, indeed, he seems to fall victim to his own industry. When in *P.L.*, vii. 618 f. Milton identifies the 'sea of glass like unto crystal' which was before the throne (Rev. iv. 6) with the ninth or crystalline sphere ('the clear Hyaline'), Mr. Whiting shows that 'the physical meaning is not the only one. The phrase ["the Glassie Sea"] is a theological term and has a meaning and history which commentators have ignored'. But it is not a little confusing to be told (pp. 103 f.) that 'In the epic, where the term is taken out of its traditional context . . . it might suggest [the angels'] spiritual intelligence' or 'the pure Word of God', or 'might suggest baptism'—especially when Mr. Whiting's 'indefatigable pursuit of the various meanings of this symbol' has led him to conclude that 'No Protestant, it seems, accepts the Roman Catholic gloss that the sea is baptism' (p. 101).

The note on the Creator and his 'golden Compasses' (*P.L.*, vii. 225), first sketched in *Notes and Queries* in 1937, was well worth developing. Mr. Whiting gives us good reason to conjecture that God the Father creating with compasses in his hand may have been represented in one of the 'storied Windows richly dight' on which Milton's imagination early fed. However that may be, this was a traditional artistic motif which came readily to his mind as he developed the theme of Prov. viii. 27. Mr. Whiting thinks it remarkable that in returning to the theologically sound doctrine of the Son as the creator of the universe the poet should have retained the compasses 'as appropriate for even a divine architect'; but he does not sufficiently consider—here as elsewhere—that Milton was not sitting here below in the cool element of prose but soaring in the high reason of his fancies. In that mood he freed the compasses from all question of mere temporal truth by proclaiming them to be ordained from everlasting—'prepar'd | In Gods Eternal store'. In like manner, twenty lines before, Milton strengthened the validity of Zechariah's image of chariots coming out from between two mountains of brass by representing them as myriads standing 'of old' 'Against a solemn day'. It is poetic not religious or moral ends that such manipulation serves, and it would be as absurd to ask the poet at such a point 'Is this literally what you believe?' as to complain about the 'mixture' of pagan and Christian symbolism in *Lycidas*.

On *Lycidas* Mr. Whiting is at his best. He may claim to have at last explained the concluding lines of the so-called digression on the corrupt clergy by integrating them and their imagery with the entire passage and its imagery, and with the related imagery of the reforming preachers. His argument is so ably documented and so persuasively conducted that even the most rooted advocates of rival interpretations must be convinced.

FITZROY PYLE

Mechanick Exercises on the Whole Art of Printing (1683-4) by Joseph Moxon. Edited by HERBERT DAVIS and HARRY CARTER. Pp. lxiv+480. London: Oxford University Press, 1958. £5. 5s. net.

After Pepys came to a closer acquaintance with Joseph Moxon his tone towards him changed: instead of 'to Moxon's' in September and October 1663 we have 'to Mr Moxon's' in March 1664. It is likely that the versatile ex-printer who stocked globes and maps made by himself and guides to navigation and textbooks on astronomy translated by himself would impress the Secretary of the Admiralty. The Oxford University Press now offer us a closer acquaintance with Moxon's great work on printing. Though *Mechanick Exercises*, vol. ii, on the 'Art of Printing' has been raided as source material and quoted piecemeal ever since its publication in 1683-4, only once since then has it been reprinted in full: in 1896 by Theodore De Vinne, and then only in a limited edition.

Examining the present edition, the modern reader's experience is likely to be that of Pepys. This is the work that profoundly influenced R. B. McKerrow and played a large part in the 'analytical' conception of bibliography.

Although himself a printer and the son of a printer, Moxon was not, by the time he wrote this volume, interested in the 'art' so much for its own sake as for the potential expression therein of the co-ordination of manual and intellectual skills that, he liked to reflect, was peculiar to man alone in creation. 'There is a pretty skill in driving a nail', he wrote, and smithing, joinery, and architecture all at times excited his descriptive talent.

Moxon has been excellently served by these editors, both of whom combine scholarship with an exceptional knowledge of the various mechanical techniques required in printing. They have seldom had to clarify Moxon's text: he had the gift of reducing complex technicalities to simple prose, and only where practice and nomenclature have become obsolete does Moxon need elucidation. By far the greater proportion of the notes rather amplify the text, in particular by relating it to surviving accounts, contemporary with Moxon, of the University printing house at Oxford, and to the Antwerp printing house of Christopher Plantin and his successors, which is richly documented for more than a century before Moxon was writing. These two sources of documents and original typographical material have been judiciously exploited by the editors to expand *Mechanick Exercises*, vol. ii, an expansion De Vinne did not attempt.

Certain points are dealt with at greater length in Appendix I. Some, for instance the note on the composition of type metal, a subject little studied, are so important an editorial contribution that they merit fuller description in the table of contents.

Punch-cutting and type-founding are an important section in Moxon's book and were crafts of which he had practical experience. Indeed, in *A History of the Old English Letter Foundries*, Reed put Moxon forward as a professional type-founder. This was bold, for it does not follow that because no more likely punch-cutter is known the new designs that appeared in England during the 1660's and 1670's must have been Moxon's. The editors take a different view: they regard him as a sporadic amateur.

They could not take further the debatable cutting by Moxon of a blackletter. He did not include this face on his specimen sheet (well reproduced as an inset), and it has not been proved that the blackletter fount bought for the University Press at Oxford in 1701 was connected with him. The drawings included in the text of vol. ii in fact throw no light on the subject. The Oxford design was used throughout the seventeenth century and for much of the eighteenth by the King's Printers, to whom it was virtually reserved.

In the Introduction the editors have assembled all that they have been able to discover of Moxon's life. This has made thirty-seven pages, and having the Life, we have foregone the Times, the details of vol. ii itself being somewhat crowded out. Yet the circumstances of the printing trade in 1663 are of interest as a setting for the publication of vol. ii. In 1662 the Act that required printed matter to be licensed imposed on the trade restrictions that made it virtually a closed shop. The Act lapsed in 1679, when vol. i was going through the press. Thus, between 1679 and 1685 the trade was open to all, and an ingenious man, armed with vol. ii, could have equipped and operated a printing house.

The editors clearly expose the prime importance of vol. ii: it was a practical handbook. Moxon descends to the least details, down to the direction from which light should fall on the compositors' cases. The existence of a market extended by the lapse of the Act may have influenced Moxon when he planned his series.

The reliance of modern bibliographical study on a knowledge of printing-house practice has influenced the editors, and their admirable contribution will be heartily welcomed. Handsomely produced, the book is the last to bear the imprint of Charles Batey, Printer to the University until October 1958, to whom the editors offer an affectionate and wholly appropriate dedication.

P. M. HANDOVER

The English Library before 1700. Studies in its History. Edited by FRANCIS WORMALD and C. E. WRIGHT. Pp. xii+274. London: Athlone Press, 1958. 35s. net.

This volume is a collection of lectures delivered in 1952 and 1954 under the auspices of the School of Librarianship and Archives, University College, London. As may be expected in a composite work of this type, even though the contributors are all experts in their chosen fields, there is no uniformity of treatment and no sense of unity. The standard of all the lectures is high but few of them make any considerable contribution to our knowledge of the early history of English libraries.

Professor Wormald's study of 'The Monastic Library' is regrettably short. He deals with the various collections of books in a monastery, their care, regulations for use, cataloguing, and press-marks. He adds very little to our knowledge of the subject although his examples are often new. It is perhaps surprising that Mr. Wormald continues to give the impression that the Lenten distribution of books for a year was the only system of loans to monks throughout the Middle

Ages. There is, however, evidence for the view that as the libraries became larger the books for annual reading were often kept separately. The chapter ends with a brief account of the methods by which the libraries were built up. Whilst it was very proper to point out that books were obtained as gifts or by purchase as well as being produced in the scriptorium, it is a pity that he did not say more about the importance of the scriptorium at certain periods and at certain places—at Christ Church, Canterbury, Rochester, Abingdon, and Durham, for example, in the twelfth century or St. Albans in the thirteenth century. The employment of professional scribes by monasteries as at Abingdon, Ralph of Pullan at Cirencester about 1150 (MSS. Jesus Coll. Oxford 52 and 63) and, on the other hand, the work of monastic scribes for others (as, for example, the books written by John of Bruges, monk of Coventry, for Coventry Church), might also have been mentioned.

The title of Dr. Ivy's lecture, 'The Bibliography of the Monastic Book', is perhaps misnamed as it is really a study in codicology, a description of the physical make-up of manuscripts and the practice of scribes. This is a very full and useful collection of information although, whilst it is true, as Dr. Ivy has shown, that manuscripts were normally written unbound, it is a pity that binding is not mentioned here. More might have been included on prickling and on ruling: variations in the use of columns and long lines and changing methods of enclosing the written space and of ruling across the page distinguish work of different periods, and, at least in the twelfth century, of different houses.

Dr. Talbot, whose contributions to Cistercian history are numerous and authoritative, has synthesized our present knowledge of book-production in the universities and has added a brief account of the effect of the coming of the friars on library administration. I have not enough space to deal adequately with this lecture, but the reader is advised to treat some of Dr. Talbot's conclusions with caution. The statement, for example, that 'only the *reportationes* of lectures followed at the university are written out by friars' is far too sweeping. There is considerable evidence of friars acting as scribes; St. Thomas Aquinas had Dominican scribes, the names of at least twenty Franciscan scribes in the convent of S. Croce in Florence have been preserved, the Franciscans of Valenciennes and Venice copied and bound books, and a friar Minor prepared a book for Elizabeth de Burgh, Lady of Clare. Dr. Talbot's final suggestion that the library economy of the friars led to the acceptance in principle of public libraries has no foundation, since their system of loans was evolved to make books more easily available to members of their Order but not, except in unusual circumstances, to anyone outside.

Professor R. M. Wilson's contribution, 'The Contents of the Mediaeval Library', suffers from two serious defects. Firstly, he has used only extant catalogues and not taken into account the lists of surviving books edited by Neil Ker and such evidence as wills or material like Leland's notes. The second and more important flaw is that the author has treated the medieval library as though it could be considered as a final and completed form, frozen at the time each catalogue was compiled. The character of the twelfth-century library, for example, was quite different from that of the thirteenth century, whilst in the fourteenth

century a Cistercian or Benedictine monastic library would have a book stock less relevant to university studies than that in a library of the mendicants. Despite these fundamental criticisms the lecture gives a useful survey of the works which are most commonly mentioned in the catalogues of medieval libraries and which would be known to contemporary writers.

The chapters on 'The revival of Greek learning' by Professor Weiss and 'The preservation of the Classics' by Dom David Knowles are disappointing. The latter, from which perhaps I expected too much, consists of a writing-up of Manitius's work in Professor Knowles's usual honey-tongued manner, together with information supplied by Professor Mynors from Boston of Bury's catalogue (Cambridge Univ. Libr. Add. MS. 3470). It is to be hoped that Professor Mynors and Dr. Hunt will soon publish this catalogue.

The finest contributions to this volume are by Dr. C. E. Wright: 'The Dispersal of the Libraries in the Sixteenth Century' and 'The Elizabethan Society of Antiquaries and the formation of the Cottonian Library'. They are both the result of accurate and careful scholarship offering us a fuller understanding of the break-up of medieval libraries and the migration of their contents during the late sixteenth century than has previously been possible. The two articles are founded on a meticulous study of the manuscript and printed sources of the period and display Dr. Wright's great erudition and lucid style. They should be recommended reading for all students of English literature and history.

The volume concludes with two contributions on Oxford and Cambridge libraries. Mr. Oates has written charmingly on 'The Libraries of Cambridge, 1570-1700', although he has not added considerably to the work of his predecessors in this field. Mr. Myres gives us a fascinating account of Oxford libraries in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries which can now be supplemented by Mr. Ker's important Sandars lectures and his introduction to the Bodleian Library Exhibition Catalogue *Oxford College Libraries in 1556*.

The book is pleasantly printed and well illustrated: a publication worthy in every respect of a University Press.

K. W. HUMPHREYS

Smollett and the Scottish School. Studies in Eighteenth-Century Thought.

By M. A. GOLDBERG. Pp. xiv + 194. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1959. \$3.00.

It has become usual, after the Peace of the Augustans, to regard eighteenth-century England as an 'intellectual battleground' of irreconcilable oppositions in politics, theology, aesthetics, and much else. At a conference of professors of English some ten years ago, however, A. S. P. Woodhouse underlined the literary importance of the Scottish 'Common-Sense' philosophical attempt to find a compromise between rationalism and empiricism. Interest in the Scottish school has been growing among metaphysicians, moralists, sociologists, and historians of criticism; but little correlation of philosophical doctrine and literary practice has yet been made.

Mr. Goldberg argues that Smollett's novels are a literary application of the Scottish compromise in philosophy; combining, for example—and therefore impartially criticizing—the views of Hobbes and Mandeville on human selfishness and the views of the Cambridge Platonists on the 'innate virtue and generosity of the human heart'. He analyses the five novels, relating their themes, characterization, and structure to the judicious balances of the philosophers; and he shows them to be much more coherent and purposeful than traditional criticism (with the notable exception of M. Eugene Joliat's) has allowed. *Roderick Random* emerges as 'a study in reason and passion', closer to novels of learning like *Wilhelm Meister* than to the mere picaresque tale, and showing how Roderick's adversities have 'enlarged the understanding, improved the heart, steeled the constitution, and qualified a young man for all the duties and enjoyments of life'. *Peregrine Pickle* resolves the conflict between imagination and judgement, *Ferdinand Count Fathom* between art and nature, *Sir Launcelot Greaves* between social and self-love, and *Humphrey Clinker* between primitivism and progress.

A general correspondence is established, with adequate documentation, between Smollett's views and those of the Scottish philosophers, and the novels gain by Mr. Goldberg's fresh approach and thorough analysis. His discussion of *Ferdinand Count Fathom* is admirable. But his thesis is too tidily comprehensive. The conflict between reason and passion, for instance, is admittedly 'central to the development' of *Roderick Random* and a crucial issue in eighteenth-century thinking; but its resolution is an unavoidable duty laid on us all, besides being a concern of the Common-Sense school. Smollett did not need the philosophers to interpret human nature in terms of both 'innate virtue and generosity' and 'the spirit of self-conceit and contradiction'. The conflict in *Peregrine Pickle*—'no man was more capable of moralising upon Peregrine's misconduct than himself; his reflections were extremely just and sagacious, and attended with no other disadvantage, but that of occurring too late'—is painfully familiar to most of us as it was to a Boswell and a Burns, one of whom little understood what the philosophers were about and the other of whom cared less. The shade of Smollett may at last have discovered that he had been talking philosophy all his life without knowing it.

For Smollett, says Mr. Goldberg, 'folly is the greatest deterrent to happiness. . . . And the greatest folly lies in the position assumed by extremists, divided into opposing camps and quarrelling . . . about issues more imaginary than real.' In illustrating this attitude, he uses some of the key ideas of the Scottish philosophers; but his essential points were—and still are—matters of common sense rather than Common-Sense. This, indeed, is the virtue of his novels in so far as they are 'criticisms of life'; and Mr. Goldberg has done well to emphasize it, even if his comparative method is too rigid always to convince.

JAMES KINSLEY

Wordsworth's Cambridge Education. By BEN ROSS SCHNEIDER, JR. Pp. xii + 298. Cambridge: University Press, 1957. 32s. 6d. net.

Every book about Wordsworth tends to be an extended commentary on *The Prelude*. Mr. Schneider's is no exception; but he has a specific purpose, namely to estimate the influence upon Wordsworth of the books he read and the friendships he formed during his Cambridge period. Mr. Schneider is modest enough, and honest enough, to state in his preface that his conclusions do little damage to established views on the subject.

What he has done is to examine in detail the curriculum and examinations which Wordsworth had to face in his college and the university; the textbooks which were prescribed; the performances of his friends in the Tripos; the reasons for his own refusal to read for honours; the vows made for him and the bond given to him in the summer vacation of 1790. After this famous 'dedication', Mr. Schneider concludes that Wordsworth made friends 'on a firmer basis than formerly . . . either serious non-reading men . . . or reading men who could interest themselves in subjects . . . outside the course for honours'. Among them were Robert Jones and William Terrot of his own college and William Mathews and Fletcher Raincock of Pembroke. To illustrate the background of 1789 Mr. Schneider gives a good account of the efforts at reform made by John Jebb and others in eighteenth-century Cambridge. So far as Wordsworth himself is concerned he lays stress upon his acceptance of Locke's 'associational psychology' and maintains that what he experienced in conversation with Michael Beaupuy in 1792 was not conversion to, but confirmation in, the ideals of republicanism. 'Coming from Cambridge, he was more philosophie than philanthropist, more Godwinite than Painite.'

Having had the advantage of consulting Godwin's manuscript diary, Mr. Schneider discusses his influence on Wordsworth in some detail. They first met in February 1795 at a tea-party at William Trent's and 'reached an immediate rapport'. After that, they met frequently and always in the morning. Mr. Schneider conjectures that 'they were the only two people in their circle who rose early enough to make use of that part of the day'.

Godwin's circle of friends and disciples in Cambridge was a large one and the exact duration of Wordsworth's acceptance of his moral and political philosophy is still a matter of controversy amongst Wordsworthian scholars. Whatever may be the precise chronology of disillusionment, Wordsworth was 'wearied out with contrarieties' and sought for comfort first (like a good Cambridge man) in mathematics and, more humanly, in the society of Coleridge and his sister Dorothy. Mr. Schneider has surveyed the movements and the personalities of eighteenth-century Cambridge with great care. Inevitably he has been forced to make a number of conjectures and assumptions and one can but regret that there is no evidence that Wordsworth ever met Henry Gunning. Gunning was liberal in the best sense of the term and had many friends among the reformers. A few pages of his lucid and kindly comment might have told us a lot about Wordsworth, the man.

S. C. ROBERTS

The Early Collected Editions of Shelley's Poems. By CHARLES H. TAYLOR, JR. Pp. xiv+108 (Yale Studies in English 140). New Haven: Yale University Press, 1958; London: Oxford University Press, 1959. 32s. net.

In this book Mr. Taylor gives a clear and detailed history of the printed text of Shelley's poems from his death until 1839. In 1824 Mrs. Shelley published the *Posthumous Poems*; this was suppressed because of the attitude of Sir Timothy Shelley, and she was not able to produce her four-volume edition of the *Poetical Works* until 1839. In the meantime five pirated collections had appeared.

The edition of 1839 contains many variants in the text, when compared with the editions published in Shelley's lifetime and with the *Posthumous Poems*. Modern editors have generally assumed that these have some authority. Mr. Taylor demonstrates convincingly that in many cases this is not so. He gives good reasons for supposing that for the *Poetical Works* Mrs. Shelley used as printer's copy not the original editions or manuscripts, but two of the unauthorized collections—for her first, third, and fourth volumes Ascham's edition of 1834, and for her second volume Galignani's of 1829. She hoped to be able to correct errors in proof, but in many cases failed to do so. Many of the 1839 variants, therefore, have no authority, but merely reproduce changes introduced in the unauthorized collections (though, of course, not all these are errors—Mrs. Shelley herself gave some help in the preparation of Galignani's edition).

Mr. Taylor gives a list of every substantial variant that he has discovered between the original editions and the first collected edition of 1839, showing in every case where 1839 follows one of the unauthorized ones. This will enable future editors to see at a glance what, if any, authority each 1839 variant has.

Mr. Taylor also draws attention to a list of errata, compiled by Mrs. Shelley and included in a few copies of the *Posthumous Poems*. Most of the changes ordered by it were made in the first of the unauthorized collections—Benbow's (1826); but it has been curiously ignored by subsequent editors. The most important change still to be made in accordance with it is the redating of *Lines to a Critic* as 1819 instead of 1817. (This has already been suggested, for other reasons, by Mr. Neville Rogers.)

Mr. Taylor has done a good piece of scholarly work. Perhaps, however, he rather exaggerates the extent to which Shelley's text has been encumbered with inferior 1839 variants. The most commonly received text is that of Hutchinson; and he, as Mr. Taylor acknowledges, was a conservative editor. In so far as his text is defective it is not because of over-reliance on 1839, but because of failure to take sufficient account of the manuscripts. He very seldom departed from the original editions in favour of 1839 without good reason.

P. H. BUTTER

Anne Brontë. Her Life and Work. By ADA HARRISON and DEREK STANFORD. Pp. 252. London: Methuen, 1959. 25s. net.

Anne Brontë. A Biography. By WINIFRED GÉRIN. Pp. xvi+368. London: Nelson, 1959. 30s. net.

The youngest Brontë has waited a long while for her due, and we need not deplore the appearance in one year of two biographies. Mrs. Harrison's scale is smaller than Miss Gérin's, and her death before the book was in proof deprived her of the opportunity of adding to her rather scanty references and, perhaps, of reconsidering her acceptance of the wildest stories about Mr. Brontë; but her study, even apart from Mr. Stanford's valuable critical chapters, need not be thought of as wholly superseded. It is important that, in handling such slender material, often obliquely transmitted, the good sense and domestic experience of each biographer confirms the other's findings. Not that these qualities are enough in themselves to assess creative genius, but in the case of the Brontës they are prerequisites. Less important, but not negligible, is the interest of occasional divergences of opinion. Mrs. Harrison thinks, for instance, that Anne outgrew her religious melancholy; Miss Gérin, with more likelihood and a sensitive use of texts, shows its recurrence and modification. On the other hand, her subtlety lures her beyond the evidence when she interprets Charlotte's discovery of Emily's poems as a death-blow to Gondal and ultimately to the imagination that engendered it. Here Mrs. Harrison, who accepts Charlotte's belief in her sister's latent ambition, appears the safer guide.

The purpose of both biographers is to revise our conception of Anne, to establish her original liveliness and enterprise and her later courage and stoical endurance. Charlotte, affectionate and short-sighted sister, is here both the chief source of knowledge and the obstacle to understanding. Miss Gérin is kinder to her than Mrs. Harrison, but she agrees that 'Charlotte added the sum up wrong', over-stressing Anne's mildness and passivity, blind to her love and grief for Willy Weightman, and disliking and undervaluing her performance in *The Tenant of Wildfell Hall*. In her Biographical Notice of Ellis and Acton Bell she started critics off on the wrong track with Anne, and in her Editor's Preface she betrayed some embarrassment about *Wuthering Heights*. It should be remembered that she was not writing simply from a critical angle. She felt called on to defend the two dead girls against the charges of coarseness and brutality which had been brought against their novels, and to insist that they were 'two unobtrusive women' of 'retiring manners and habits', and Anne, at least, a devout Christian. If much of this is now beside the point and even misleading, it did not seem so to the surviving sister. She wished to 'leave their dear names free from soil'.

We have in Miss Gérin's book what is probably the definitive collection of biographical material about Anne. Living in Haworth, she has been able to follow every clue. Her reconstruction of the local circles that the sisters moved in, the houses they visited and worked in, the resources of the Keighley Mechanics' Institute library, and her careful and imaginative use of their letters, music,

books, and drawings and of the traditions about them are full of substance and illumination. She examines Anne's writings closely, and is aware of what Mr. Stanford calls 'the fructifying aspect of Branwell's passion' on the novelist's imagination. She is probably right in her contention that the immediate reflection of Branwell is to be found not so much in Huntington as in Lord Lowborough. By close and imaginative work she fills in the faint outline of her subject and establishes the positive qualities that differentiated the youngest Brontë from her sisters; and if there is now and then an innocent excess of dramatic participation, it is seen for what it is and does no harm.

It is this positive quality that Mr. Stanford sets out to identify in his cool and precise assessment of the verses. Apart from the Gondal poems, the substance of Anne's verse is moral reflection on her own experience, and the mode is a lucid, scrupulous, and graceful statement, free from any touch of exaggeration. He does not overstate its claims, but directs attention to such delicate colouring and metrical variety as might easily be overlooked in work whose very translucence tempts us to read too quickly. In his discussion of the novels he lays most stress on Anne's admirable realism and her independent spirit. She is not, however, the first woman writer to approve her heroine's bolting of the door against a brutal husband. Mary Wollstonecraft does so in *The Wrongs of Women*. Mrs. Pryor in *Shirley* leaves a husband equally debased, and Frances Henri, we are told in an entirely extraneous conversation in *The Professor*, would have acted in the same way. There are closer links between the sisters than Mr. Stanford always allows. He writes with appreciation of Anne's handling of the trial of strength between the two boys in 'I Dreamt Last Night'—'a rare triumph for the feminine author'—without observing that the same theme is touched in the rough-and-tumble between Crimsworth and Hunsden in *The Professor*. These were plainly things that the Brontë girls discussed, part of their common intellectual and imaginative life, however distinct the artistic results.

Anne has now been 'seriously considered as an artist' through the whole of her work, and it has proved to be worth doing.

J. M. S. TOMPKINS

A Grammar of Metaphor. By CHRISTINE BROOKE-ROSE. Pp. xii+344.
London: Secker and Warburg, 1958. 42s. net.

Of all features of diction in poetry, metaphor seemed to Aristotle to be the very tongue of the trump, yet (as Miss Brooke-Rose points out in this notable and original book) his attempts at classifying metaphor were not only 'peculiarly useless' in themselves, but in any case dealt solely with idea-content and had nothing to say about the syntactic forms within which metaphor is presented. Unclear and deficient classification of metaphor has persisted even among modern critics, according to Miss Brooke-Rose, because our favourite terms 'image' and 'imagery' tend to wrap up metaphor with the related but separate modes of simile, description, myth, and allegory, and because the purely linguistic analysis of metaphor has been slow to develop. *A Grammar of Metaphor*

can rightly claim to be the first essay in systematic analysis and classification of metaphors by their grammatical structure and in accordance with a defined view of what a metaphor is ('any replacement of one word by another, or any identification of one thing, concept or person with any other'). Examples are taken from a fairly representative list of poems, or parts of poems, by fifteen poets from Chaucer to Dylan Thomas.

Noun metaphors receive the most detailed treatment. The main categories (each with elaborate subdivisions) follow an admirably consistent scheme, from Simple Replacement (the proper term unmentioned, and so to be guessed by the reader), through Pointing Formulae of various kinds (the tenor stated, and the vehicle linked with it by demonstratives, parallelism, apposition, vocatives, the copula 'to be', and—a rather dubious addition, moving from metaphor into fairy-tale literalism—the verb 'to make'), to the Genitive Link (the vehicle linked, mainly by the preposition 'of', to a third term, and not necessarily to its original tenor). There is a briefer but shrewd and interesting investigation of verb metaphors; and adjective, adverb, pronoun, and preposition complete the survey, except for a somewhat hectic chapter on the complexities of verb+noun metaphors (a subject that begins to need another book), and a general concluding comment on the metaphorical practice and success of each of the selected poets. In a study that makes hard demands on the reader, there are nevertheless some refreshing sallies into wider issues, from a reasoned attack on Fenollosa's influential dogmas to a warning on the dangers of juxtaposition in modern poetry, and to *obiter dicta* like: 'Poets are not particularly empirical: there are very few examples of the type, "oh, that my heart could fly," implying that it cannot' (p. 231).

The categories established by Miss Brooke-Rose do succeed in describing the material, and one's only reservation might be that a wholly satisfactory description can hardly be given in terms of the old parts of speech. The adjective, for example, receives short shrift in this book, and one of the reasons is that the author is loath to accept a functional, as distinct from a generic, adjectivality. It is a well-known characteristic of English (and not, as she suggests, something exceptional) that nouns, verbs, and other parts of speech are continually being used as adjectives, and frequently in a metaphorical application (cf. *shadow cabinet*, *blanket concession*, *kill switch*, *undercover agent*). To say of phrases like '*crystal heavens*' and '*infant crown*', rather grudgingly admitted as adjective metaphors, that in these the adjective is 'in reality a noun' (p. 244), is to give a curious reversal to the true state of affairs. In the same way, Miss Brooke-Rose quotes '*frozen chastity*' under verb metaphors, but that past participle, which in most of its metaphorical uses has lost its verb-quality, would be more reasonably considered as an adjective—if we are to employ such terms.

The author's account of metaphor, however, is not restricted to analysis and description. The parts of her book that have the greatest general interest are those where she indicates, very convincingly on the whole, 'that the different uses of language in metaphor by individual poets do reveal tendencies at least, if not conscious choice'. Quality of idea-content is still the dominant virtue of metaphor, but Miss Brooke-Rose leaves no doubt that in ignoring its syntactical

presentation we have missed a significant element of style. Some of her readings of the poetry may be criticized: in the passage from Browning's 'An Epistle' on p. 77, *fume* refers not to Christ's action or the principle of life but to the belief of Lazarus that he had been brought back from the dead; in Dylan Thomas's line 'And the sun grew round that very day', she claims *round* as a preposition-metaphor, though the word is almost certainly an adjective (p. 258); and there is a slightly perverse unwillingness to receive the modulating distinctions of Spenser's admittedly conventional yet not ludicrous *Amoretti* (p. 203). But the results of her inquiry merit consideration. Donne, Shakespeare, and Thomas (as might have been expected) prove the most bold manipulators as well as conceivers of metaphor, and Milton, Browning, and Eliot provide the least interesting material. Pope's high percentage of verb metaphors is interpreted as a deliberate effort on his part to break away from the noun-assertiveness and copula-aggressiveness of the seventeenth century. Keats is revealed as hopelessly addicted to the most ambiguous sorts of Genitive Links (though *Endymion* was scarcely a fair 'sampling', and in any case the author avoids the whole question of whether for some kinds of poetry loose grammar—even what she calls clumsy grammar—may not be perfectly in order). A suggestive comparison is drawn between Milton and Eliot in their use of a language that is 'poised, evocative, but dry, static, passionless, and unexploited for metaphoric change'. The gulf between metaphorical usage in Chaucer (with his simple Simple Replacements) and in Shakespeare (all stunning Copulas and rare Make-Links) is tentatively explained as due to the weakening of the medieval 'sacramental' world-view and the growth of individualism. 'To Shakespeare, *A* is *B*, because he makes it so, not because it *is*'.

Clearly Miss Brooke-Rose has produced a work which is of interest to literary critics and linguists alike. Whatever doubts one may have about the value-status she imparts to grammatical usages, she argues in an intelligent fashion that this is something we must at least think over.

A good book deserves better proof-reading than this: Rosemund Tuve, W. H. Clemens, Spencer, Mallarmé, Eliot's 'objective relative', misquoted book-titles on p. 34 and p. 129, misquoted poems on p. 54 (Blake) and p. 128 (Yeats), and words like *sublety*, *letterin*, *Redlacing*, *transitixe*, and *quattor*.

EDWIN MORGAN

SHORT NOTICES

Richard the Third (1597). Edited by SIR WALTER GREG. Pp. x+98 (Shakespeare Quarto Facsimiles 12). Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1959. 25s. net.

This is the fourth of the Shakespeare Facsimiles since the Clarendon Press took over the series, and it is technically the most successful. The fine-screen offset process is uniform in its inking according to the variable quarto characteristics and the focus is sharp. The best available complete copy of this rare play has been chosen (British Museum, Huth 47), with the advantage that this differs from the Devonshire (now the Huntington) copy used for the Griggs facsimile issued in 1886. As a thoughtful gesture, leaf A3 from the Second Quarto (1598) has been reproduced to illustrate the two lines of text at l. i.

101-2 that complete the jest about Mistress Shore. These are missing from the three complete copies of the first edition but are surely authoritative and may just possibly have been added by late press-correction in Q1, although examples are not extant.

The late Sir Walter Greg's introduction exemplifies his invariable characteristics of conciseness and clarity in the presentation of fact. What is known about the publishing history of the 1597 quarto, the details of its printing, and the whereabouts of the preserved copies are provided. We also have the usual valuable list confirming doubtful readings in the original, and to this is added a collation of variant readings in the known copies. This list may somewhat puzzle the bibliographically innocent, for twenty-two of the readings are described as only apparently variant and thus the result of bad inking or of broken or dirty type, and only one reading is identified as a true press-correction. The ascription is almost certainly right on the face of it because of the random appearance of the phenomena in the various copies, but a brief bibliographical explanation might have been useful to instruct those users who may not be capable of understanding the reasons for the decision from their own analysis of the evidence.

It is an excellent sign that the production of these valuable facsimiles is proceeding with expedition.

FREDSON BOWERS

Poets' Grammar. Person, Time and Mood in Poetry. By FRANCIS BERRY.

Pp. x+190. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1958. 21s. net.

Recent critical interest in the grammatical articulation of poetry, rather than in imagery and symbolism, is reflected in Mr. Berry's interesting, if only tentative, study. His theme is that grammatical forms, no less than choice of vocabulary or any other distinctive feature, are intimate components of a poet's purpose and a poem's effectiveness. The thesis is illustrated by examination of usages of pronoun, verb, and preposition in a selection of writers that is too scrappy and idiosyncratic to be more than suggestive, but suggestive of a fruitful critical approach.

In the best of these loosely connected essays Mr. Berry shows much insight: in the careful and often subtle distinctions he establishes between the use of 'thou' and the use of 'you' in Shakespeare's sonnets, in Donne's love poems, and in Tourneur's *The Revenger's Tragedy*, where each poet takes advantage in an individual way of the contemporary fluidity of relationship between the weakening 'thou' and the supplanting 'you'. In some essays he does not quite prove his case (though one feels he may be right) because he accepts a too ready equivalence of grammatical and mental categorization (cf. statements like 'Damnation is a state where the Subjunctive does not exist'); this results in an ambiguous shuffling between the strictly parseworthy denotations of words like 'indicative', 'subjunctive', 'mood', and 'present' and their connotations in general usage. In the perceptive essay on *Macbeth*, for instance, where Mr. Berry is concerned to show how the play is dominated by future tense and subjunctive mood, he quotes the passage in which Macbeth speaks of his 'present fears' and 'horrible imaginings' (I. iii. 137-42) as a moment when 'the Subjunctive is started into life'—yet all the verbs in these six lines are in fact in the indicative mood. 'Modulation' is indeed an important, and still largely unstudied, part of poetic effect (a striking and beautiful example which Mr. Berry does not quote is Tennyson's 'Break, break, break'), but it is not invariably expressed through fluctuations of grammatical 'mood'.

The weakness of the book is that its grammatical premises are too nonchalantly set up, and too unrigorously applied. It will not do—though the author tries to forestall this objection—to state bluntly that 'The Classical Grammarians . . . perceived their categories to lie in the structure of the mind'. It is probably this rather comforting belief that tempts Mr. Berry at times (as in the essays on Keats and Shelley) to forget his avowed thesis and write fairly straightforward literary criticism in which his grammatical armour has worn metaphysically thin or simply been dropped. But the book is a useful piece of personal prospecting—the author himself claims no more—in the area which has been explored from various directions by Professor Josephine Miles, Dr. Donald Davie, and Miss Christine Brooke-Rose.

EDWIN MORGAN

American English. By ALBERT H. MARCKWARDT. Pp. xiv+194. New York: Oxford University Press, 1958. 32s. net.

In 1908, as literary critic of the *Smart Set*, H. L. Mencken 'began his self-appointed task of removing the undergrowth which concealed the living body of an authentically American language and literature' (*The Times*, 30 Jan. 1956). His literary activities were to exercise a profound influence on American writing, but his greatest work remains *The American Language* (1918), a vast miscellany of wit, scholarship, and acerbity, with its two large supplementary volumes of 1945 and 1948. Meanwhile G. P. Krapp covered the same ground somewhat more conservatively in the two volumes of his *English Language in America* (1925). These hold the field, and their pre-eminence is not brought into question by Professor A. H. Marckwardt's concise and necessarily largely derivative *American English*. In nine short chapters Mr. Marckwardt conducts us through the familiar but absorbing story of the development of the American branch of English from the colonial period to the present day. The chapter on neologisms ('Yankee Ingenuity and the Frontier Spirit') brings out the raciness of the American contribution, exhibited by such words as *disk jockey*, *rat race*, *scoop*, and *soap opera*. Due attention is paid to 'The Gentle Tradition' (*mortician*, *exterminating engineer* [= rat-catcher], *comfort station*, &c.), and, among others, there are chapters on regional and social differences of vocabulary and pronunciation within America, and on the affinities of earlier and current varieties of American English with the English spoken in this country in the Elizabethan period. Apart from some rather surprising examples of 'typical Criticisms' on pp. 2-3 and elsewhere (which will presumably be replaced in future impressions), the book may be recommended to readers in this country who prefer the small chime of a 'Home University'-sized book to the great bells of Krapp and Mencken.

R. W. BURCHFIELD

The Business of Criticism. By HELEN GARDNER. Pp. x+158. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1959. 15s. net.

This little book contains two sets of lectures, of which the first series, 'The Profession of a Critic', was given in the University of London in 1953, and the second, 'The Limits of Literary Criticism', in the University of Durham King's College, Newcastle, as the Riddell Memorial Lectures in 1956. Having had the privilege of reviewing the latter in this journal when they were first published (*R.E.S.*, N.S. ix (1958), 106-9) I will confine my present remarks to the former.

Miss Gardner lets in, upon the superheated and rather suffocating atmosphere of literary criticism, a most salutary breath of Johnsonian fresh air. 'The amateur is being squeezed out in every field', as she truly says—and not least in criticism, where the 'refinements of subtlety and the dogmatism of learning' have now fairly got the upper hand of the common reader. Miss Gardner's great merit is that although she is herself a professional scholar-critic, perfectly equipped with all the skills and insights of the new criticism, she has a mind so robust that she can use them as tools instead of being at their mercy. To begin with, she insists that criticism is to be a Torch to illumine, not a Sceptre to intimidate. In the business of interpretation we must, indeed, use all the techniques with which modern knowledge can supply us; in particular, we must master the historical approach. But in reconstructing a writer's historical setting we must avoid the common error of confusing 'history' with mere 'history of ideas', and thereby losing sight of the rich variety and particularity of real history. We must always remember, too, that the great writers transcend, as well as reflect, the 'ways of thought' of their times. The critic must learn to recognize and respond to the tones of voice and the distinctive idioms of each writer, so as to be able to interpret him, not by a clever game of subjective 'explication' (in which the reader learns more about the critic's great perceptiveness than about the author and his work), but by referring to the author's own habitual usage in other relevant passages. However much we may have learnt (and we have learnt a lot) about patterns of

images, and 'real' behind 'ostensible' meanings, we must try not to lose sight of the man writing for men at a particular moment of history. Miss Gardner illustrates these points by brilliant commentaries on the plot of *Hamlet*, on the 'naked new-born babe' passage in *Macbeth*, and on Donne's 'Air and Angels'. It is refreshing to meet with a critic so learned and subtle, and yet so 'uncorrupted with literary prejudices'.

BASIL WILLEY

A Review of English Literature. Vol. I, No. 1. Pp. 80. Edited by A. NORMAN JEFFARES. London: Longmans, Green, 1960. 15s. per annum.

In the Editorial of the first number of this new literary journal, Professor Jeffares announces the intention of his review as offering 'criticism of English literature to an audience which it is hoped will consist not only of those who are professionally engaged in the study and teaching of literature but also of general readers'. Breadth of appeal in presentation will also, it is hoped, be combined with a wide interpretation of the term 'English Literature' to include Commonwealth and American writing.

In trying to avoid 'over-specialised criticism' on the one hand, and fashionable controversy on the other, the editor accepts the hazard of an unexciting compromise. It remains to be seen whether the magazine can capture and hold the interest of the kind of reader at which it is aimed.

Articles in the first issue are listed in the 'Summary of Periodical Literature' in our May number.

E. M.

J. A. M. R.

SUMMARY OF PERIODICAL LITERATURE

ANGLIA

Band 77, Heft 3, 1959

The Split Infinitive (W. M. Smith), 257-78.

Die 'Nine Worthies' (K. J. Höltgen), 279-309.

Die Bankett-Szene in Marlowes *Tamburlaine* (E. Schuster and H. Oppel), 310-45.

Band 77, Heft 4, 1959

Language and Dating in OE. Inscriptions (R. I. Page), 385-406.

Neue Wege der englischen Phonetik (H. Pilch), 407-28.

Semantische Genusdifferenzierungen im Neuenglischen (B. Carstensen), 429-75.

BULLETIN OF THE JOHN RYLANDS LIBRARY
Vol. xlii, No. 2, March 1960

The Parables as Allegory (M. Black), 273-87.

The Wyclifite *Pater Noster* and *Ten Commandments* [English MSS. 85 and 90 in the John Rylands Library] (A. L.

Kellogg and E. W. Talbert), 345-77.

Francis Thompson: 1859-1907 (F. N. Lees), 378-94.

Ruskin's Friendship with Mrs. Fanny Talbot (M. E. Spence), 453-80.

COMPARATIVE LITERATURE

Vol. xi, No. 4, Fall 1959

The 'Canticus Troili': Chaucer and Petrarch (P. Thomson), 313-28.

Ash Wednesday: The Purgatorio in a Modern Mode (Sister M. Cleophas, R.S.M.), 329-39.

ENGLISH

Vol. xiii, No. 73, Spring 1960

Coleridge as Poet and Philosopher of Love (D. Stanford), 3-7.

Poetic Form Today (P. West), 8-12.

The Nonconformists: Angry Young Men, 'Lucky Jims', and 'Outsiders' (H. Peschmann), 12-16.

ENGLISH STUDIES

Vol. xli, No. 2, April 1960

New Light on the English Actors in the Netherlands, c. 1590-c. 1660 (J. G. Riewald), 65-92.

Eighteenth and Nineteenth Century English Punctuation Theory (P. Honan), 93-102.

Current Literature, 1958: Criticism and Biography (F. T. Wood), 112-23.

ÉTUDES ANGLAISES

XIII^e Année, janvier-mars 1960

The Two Gentlemen of Verona, Twelfth Night, et Gl'Ingannati (R. Pruvost), 1-9.

Edwin Muir (G. Marcel), 10-25.

La Trilogie romanesque de L. P. Hartley (J.-P. Vernier), 26-31.

Ruskin d'après des livres nouveaux (P. Fontaney), 32-37.

Un Inédit de Raleigh sur la Succession (P. Lefranc), 38-46.

346 SUMMARY OF PERIODICAL LITERATURE

XIII^e Année, No. 2, avril-juin 1960
Shakespeare et le théâtre élisabéthain en France depuis cinquante ans [symposium], 101-318.

HUNTINGTON LIBRARY QUARTERLY
Vol. xxiii, No. 2, February 1960

Milton and Mazzoni: The Genre of the *Divina Commedia* (J. M. Steadman), 107-22.
Suicide in Eighteenth Century England: The Myth of a Reputation (R. Bartel), 145-58.
'Rage or Raillery': Swift's *Epistle to a Lady and On Poetry: A Rapsody* (G. P. Mayhew), 159-80.
Alterations in the First Edition of Greene's *A Quip for an Upstart Courtier*, 1592 (R. B. Parker), 181-6.
Mason, Walpole, and that 'rogue' Almon (R. R. Rea), 187-93.

LENGUAS VIVAS

Año III, Nos. 5-6, noviembre 1959
The Nationalism of Walt Whitman (J. C. Bushman), 7-12.
Macbeth: Classical and Medieval Drama (G. S. Charosky), 21-28.

MEDIUM ÆVUM

Vol. xxviii, No. 3, 1959
Flattery and the *Moralitas* of the Nonne Preestes Tale (J. M. Steadman), 172-9.
Two Notes on Dame Sirith (B. Miller), 180-8.

MODERN FICTION STUDIES

Vol. v, No. 4, Winter 1959-60
Southern Writers: A Critical Symposium on Wolfe, Glasgow, Faulkner, McCullers, Anderson, and Porter, 295-364.

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

Vol. lxxv, No. 1, January 1960
January's 'Aube' in the *Merchant's Tale* (R. E. Kaske), 1-4.
Simkin's Camus Nose: A Latin Pun in the *Reeve's Tale*? (J. M. Steadman), 4-8.
Marvell's 'Coy Mistress' and Desperate Lover (L. W. Hyman), 8-10.
Dating the Trinity MS. of Milton's Poems (J. T. Shawcross), 11-17.
J. P. Kennedy on Poe: An Unpublished Letter (W. S. Osborne), 17-18.
The 'Deaf Mute' Confidence Man: Melville's Impostor in Action (P. Reeves), 18-20.
The Mill on the Floss and Keller's *Romeo und Julia auf dem Dorfe* (A. Casson), 20-22.
T. S. Eliot's Case-Book (D. S. Bland), 23-26.

Eliot's *The Hollow Men* and Shakespeare's *Julius Caesar* (R. F. Gleckner), 26-28.
The Wake in Faulkner's *Sanctuary* (W. B. Stein), 28-29.
The Truth of Frost's *Directive* (R. Peters), 29-32.

Vol. lxxv, No. 2, February 1960

Horse or Horses: A Chaucerian Textual Problem [*Canterbury Tales*, Prol., l. 74] (G. Ethel), 97-101.
The 'Philosophre' of Chaucer's Parson (R. C. Fox), 101-2.
The Fatal Bark [*Lycidas*] (M. Lloyd), 103-8.
Milton's Eve and the Evening Angels (D. C. Allen), 108-9.
The Twin Motif in *The Fall of the House of Usher* (W. B. Stein), 109-11.
A Gloss on *The Red Badge of Courage* (E. Solomon), 111-13.
James's Use of the Word 'Wonderful' in *The Ambassadors* (M. K. Michael), 114-17.
George Peele and *A Farewell to Arms*: A Thematic Tie? (J. L. Mazzaro), 118-19.
Yeats's Arthurian Black Tower (W. J. Keith), 119-23.
A Page [572-3] in *Finnegans Wake* Explained (M. P. Hornik), 123-6.
L'Invention poétique et l'automatisme mental (C. Vigée), 143-54.

MODERN LANGUAGE QUARTERLY

Vol. xxi, No. 1, March 1960
The First Romantic Aesthetics (R. Immerwahr), 3-26.
On the Meaning of *Pearl*, 139-40 (D. C. Fowler), 27-29.
Marvell's *Nymph Complaining for the Death of Her Faun* (P. Legouis), 30-32.
Shakespeare's 'Mingled Yarn' (W. N. King), 33-44.
Vaughan's Pilgrim and the Birds of Night (R. A. Durr), 45-58.
The Heroic Ideal in Doughty's *Arabia Deserta* (J. Bishop), 59-68.

MODERN LANGUAGE REVIEW

Vol. lv, No. 2, April 1960
New Poems by Sir Robert Ayton (C. B. Gullans), 160-8.
Swift and the Passions (C. Peake), 169-80.
Verwey and Shelley (B. M. Baxter), 221-33.
'Cristene Man Pu Lerne of Loue', a Medieval Lyric (E. V. Mead), 234-8.
Hamlet's 'Apprehension' (T. Hawkes), 238-41.
All's Well, IV. ii. 38 (H. W. Jones), 241-2.
Browning's 'Great Text in Galatians' (D. D. Waters, Jr.), 243-4.

SUMMARY OF PERIODICAL LITERATURE

347

First English Translation of Schiller's *History of the Thirty Years War* (J. Hennig), 249-54.

MODERN PHILOLOGY

Vol. *lvii*, No. 3, February 1960

'Ignorance in Knowledge': Marlowe's Faustus and Ford's Giovanni (C. Hoy), 145-54.
Joyce's Sermon on Hell: Source and Backgrounds (J. R. Thrane), 172-98.

NEOPHILOLOGUS

44ste Jaarg., Afl. 2, April 1960

Allegorical Tradition and the OE. Exodus (J. E. Cross and S. I. Tucker), 122-7.
Shakespeare's Use of the Grand Entry (J. W. Draper), 128-35.

NOTES AND QUERIES

Vol. *vii*, N.S. No. 2, February 1960

Giles Fletcher the Elder and the Earl of Essex, 42-46.

The Source of *Arthur*, an Early Fifteenth Century Verse Chronicle, 46-47.

Charles Sledd, Spymaster, 47-48.

Acrasia in *The Tablet of Cebes*, 48-49.

Talus in Spenser's *Faerie Queene*, 49.

Possible Sources for *The Unfortunate Traveller*, 49-50.

Priscilla's 'grotte': An Emendation in *The Unfortunate Traveller*, 50-51.

Another Allusion to Thomas Nashe, 51.

Astrophel and Stella, xxxi, 51-52.

Richard Johnson in *England's Helicon*, 52.

A Jonson Attribution, 52-53.

The Barren Plane-Tree in Donne's *The Autumnall*, 53.

Phineas Fletcher: Additions and Corrections, 54.

The Microcosm of Man: Some References to a Commonplace, 54-56.

Middleton's Way with Names, 56-60.

Sir John Harrington's Epigrammatic Lyric, 60-61.

More Seventeenth Century Admirers of Herbert, 62-63.

A New MS. of the Countess of Pembroke's Epitaph, 63-64.

Robert Heath and an Ambiguity in Wing's *S.T.C.*, 64.

The Date of Vaughan's *Silex Scintillans*, 64-65.

Notes on Vaughan, 65-67.

Shadwell, 'Flail of Sense': *Mac Flecknoe*, i, 89, 67-68.

Samuel Pepys and Samuel Martin, 68-69.

The Douai MS. of Lee's *Mithridates*, 69-70.

A Note in Summers's Edition of *The Way of the World*, corrected, 70.

'Spificcate', 70.

Salpicón: A Borrowing from French?, 70-71.

Johnson's 'Bibliothèque', 71.

Some Medical Words and *O.E.D.*, 71-72.

'Hassock of Hair', 72-73.

Locke and Stevenson on Comparative Mortality, 73.

Joseph's Speech in *Wuthering Heights*, 73-76.

Vol. *vii*, N.S. No. 3, March 1960

A Friend of Shelley: Dr. James Lind, 83-93.

'Rampallian' [2 *Henry IV*, ii. i. 65], 93.

Chaucer's *Prologue*, A 696-8, 93-95.

Middleton's Way with Names, 95-98.

Morgan and Hohlfeld's *German Literature in British Magazines* and the Füsslis, 99.

An Unrecorded Sense of 'cut', 99.

Blake's *Infant Sorrow*, 99-100.

Blake, Wicksteed, and the Wicked Swan, 100-1.

Clevedon Revisited: Coleridge's *Reflections on having left a Place of Retirement*, 101-2.

Joseph Sterling's *Cambuscan* in Coleridge's *Kubla Khan*, 102-3.

Kubla Khan and *Tom Jones*: An Unnoticed Parallel, 103-5.

Byron and Churchill: Further Parallels, 105-7.

Satan and Prometheus in Captivity, 107-8.

Dr. Johnson and Jane Austen, 108-12.

De Quincey Quotes Himself, 112-13.

An Earlier Version of *Abou Ben Adhem*, 113.

Vol. *vii*, N.S. No. 4, April 1960

Chaucer's *Prologue* A 467, 129-30.

A Note on 'Attendable', 130.

A Dutch Edition of Greene's *A Quip for an Upstart Courtier* (1601), 130-4.

The Vocabulary of John Marston (XX), 135-6.

Middleton's Way with Names, 136-40.

Thomas Howard's *Seven Wise Mistresses*, 140-2.

'Near-Print', 142.

Oroonoko: A Study of the Factual Elements, 142-5.

Mr. and Mrs. Dickens: The Thomson-Stark Letter, 145-7.

A Note on *Daniel Deronda*, 147-8.

'Lay-By', 148.

Mauberley's 'Medallion', 148.

The Identity of 'Eric Harrison', 149.

The Death Certificate of Stephen Crane, 149-50.

Pincher Martin and *The Coral Island*, 150.

348 SUMMARY OF PERIODICAL LITERATURE

Goethe and Mark Twain, 150-1.
Joyce's Use of Sidney Lanier, 151.

Vol. vii, N.S. No. 5, May 1960

Two Booklovers [Robert Devereux, Earl of Essex, and Thomas Tenison, Archbishop of Canterbury], 162-5.
'Lucre of Vileynye': Chaucer's Prioress and the Canonists, 165-7.
OE. 'Cearegst', 167.
Langland's 'Sire Piers of Pridie', 167-8.
Chaucer's Long Lease and the Date of His Birth, 168.
Ralph Roister Doister, 168-70.
Seneca in *The Misfortunes of Arthur*, 171.
'Overture', 171-2.
Pericles' 'Most Heavenly Musicke', 172-4.
The Falling 'Curtain' in Jonson's *Masque of Blacknessse*, 174-5.
Middleton's Way with Names, 175-9.
Three Words in a Courtesy Book, 181-2.
The Letters of Cecilia Ridley (1819-45), and *O.E.D.*, 184-5.
R. H. Hutton's *Essays Theological and Literary*: Bibliographical Note, 185-7.
An Appraisal of Arthur Symons by Pater and Mallarmé, 187-8.
W. H. Hudson's Visit to Ireland, 188.
A Footnote to Hardy's *Channel Firing*, 188-9.

PHILOLOGICAL QUARTERLY

Vol. xxxix, No. 1, January 1960

Conrad's Symbolic Imagery in *Heart of Darkness* (S. C. Wilcox), 1-17.
The Significance of Whitman's *Calamus* Themes (C. Griffith), 18-38.
Fielding's Changing Politics and *Joseph Andrews* (M. C. Battestin), 39-55.
French Sources of Goldsmith's *The Good Natur'd Man* (B. Gassman), 56-65.
The Challenge to Single Combat in *Samson Agonistes* (G. R. Waggoner), 82-92.
Tradition and Innovation in Milton's 'Sin' (J. M. Steadman), 93-103.
The Date of *The Malcontent* (G. Cross), 104-13.
Desdemona's Last Moments (T. D. Bowmen), 114-18.
Thomas Heywood and Literary Piracy (C. A. Patrides), 118-22.
Fals Eneas and Sely Dido (D. R. Bradley), 122-5.
Aeneas' Vision of Creusa and Milton's Sonnet xxiii (T. B. Stroup), 125-6.
Namier and Auden's *Musée des Beaux Arts* (M. Charney), 129-31.
A 1613 Chaucer Allusion (D. B. J. Randall), 131-2.

PUBLICATIONS OF THE MODERN LANGUAGE ASSOCIATION

Vol. lxxv, No. 1, March 1960

'I Sing of a Myden' (S. Manning), 8-12.
The Reliability of Anthony Wood and Milton's Oxford M.A. (J. M. French), 22-30.
The Appeal of Dryden's Heroic Plays (T. H. Fujimura), 37-45.
Gray's 'Frail Memorial' to West (J. Foladare), 61-65.
The Dialectic of Experience: Wordsworth's *Resolution and Independence* (A. E. M. Conran), 66-74.
Longfellow and his Cross of Snow (J. M. Cox), 97-100.
The Upas Tree: Pushkin and Erasmus Darwin (R. F. Gustafson), 101-9.
Yeats's Byzantium Poems (C. Bradford), 110-25.
Forster's Metaphysical Novel (C. Hoy), 126-36.
Art and the Existential in *En Attendant Godot* (L. E. Harvey), 137-46.
Blake and Nontheism (N. Nathan), 147.
The Cenci as a Stage Play (M. Kessel and B. O. States, Jr.), 147-9.
Structure and Sympathy in Joyce's *The Dead* (C. C. Loomis, Jr.), 149-51.

RENAISSANCE AND MODERN STUDIES

Vol. iii, 1959

The Symbolism of Violence: A Note on Romantic Painting (A. Smart), 5-24.
Henry Adams as Novelist (D. S. R. Welland), 25-50.
Spenser's Amoretti and Tasso's Lyrical Poetry (V. Kostić), 51-77.
Anti-Mechanism and the Comic in the Writings of Dickens (S. M. Smith), 131-44.

REVIEW OF ENGLISH LITERATURE

Vol. i, No. 2, April 1960

Thoughts on Contemporary Fiction (K. W. Gransden), 7-17.
A Note on Ivy Compton-Burnett (D. W. Jefferson), 19-24.
The Girl at the Gaol Gate [Irish Fiction] (F. O'Connor), 25-33.
Structure and Style in the Novels of C. P. Snow (M. Millgate), 34-41.
Angus Wilson (I. Scott-Kilvert), 42-53.
The Novels of Elizabeth Taylor (R. Liddell), 54-61.
The World of William Golding (P. Green), 62-72.
Fourth Dimension [Lawrence Durrell]: Review Article (F. Kermode), 73-77.

SEWANEE REVIEW

Vol. lxviii, No. 2, Spring 1960

A Defense of Delilah (W. Empson), 240-55.

SUMMARY OF PERIODICAL LITERATURE 349

Joyce and the Finite Order (D. Donoghue), 256-73.

SHAKESPEARE QUARTERLY

Vol. x, No. 4, Autumn 1959

The Roman Tongue [Antony and Cleopatra] (M. Lloyd), 461-8.

Santayana on Shakespeare (J. M. Major), 469-80.

The Tragic Structure of *Troilus and Cressida* (B. Morris), 481-92.

Acts IV and V of *Timon of Athens* (W. M. T. Nowotny), 493-8.

King Lear: A Study of Balanced and Shifting Sympathies (E. A. Block), 499-512.

Folk Medicine and the Four Fairies of *M.N.D.* (L. A. Reynolds and P. Sawyer), 513-22.

Shakespeare's 'Folly': *King Lear* (C. S. French), 523-30.

The Tempest as Pastoral Romance (C. Gesner), 531-40.

The Copy for the Folio *Richard III* (F. Bowers), 541-4.

Vol. xi, No. 1, Winter 1960

Form and Formality in *Romeo and Juliet* (H. Levin), 3-12.

A Little More than a Little [History Plays] (R. J. Dorius), 13-26.

A New Author for *Pericles*? (F. D. Hoeniger), 27-38.

Forgeries in the Stationers' Registers (F. Dickey), 39-48.

Disguise in *King Lear*: Kent and Edgar (H. Maclean), 49-54.

Sex and Pessimism in *King Lear* (R. H. West), 55-60.

The Probable Origin of Ariel (R. R. Reed, Jr.), 61-66.

Shakespeare's Christian Sonnet? (CXLVI) (B. C. Southam), 67-71.

STUDIES IN PHILOLOGY

Vol. xvii, No. 1, January 1960

Cavendish's *Life of Wolsey*: The Artistry of a Tudor Biographer (R. S. Sylvester), 44-71.

Henry Fielding's Satire on the Royal Society (H. K. Miller), 72-86.

The Genesis of *Jude the Obscure* (J. Paterson), 87-98.

TEXAS STUDIES IN LITERATURE AND LANGUAGE

Vol. i, No. 4, Winter 1960

The Interrelationship between Language and Culture (A. Sommerfelt), 449-56.

The Province of Allegory in George Herbert's Verse (R. L. Montgomery, Jr.), 457-72.

King John and *King Lear* (R. A. Law), 473-6.

Moby Dick and the Nineteenth-Century Scene (W. T. Weatherly), 477-501.

Ford's Tragic Perspective (R. J. Kauffmann), 522-57.

Symbolism of the Cyclical Myth in *Endymion* (R. Harrison), 538-54.

Ritual in Hemingway's *Big Two-Hearted River* (W. B. Stein), 555-61.

Elizabethan Literature Today (P. A. Jorgensen), 562-78.

TULANE STUDIES IN ENGLISH

Vol. ix, 1959

The Bereaved Narrator in Chaucer's *The Book of the Duchess* (R. M. Lumiansky), 5-17.

Middleton's *Women Beware Women* (I. Ribner), 19-33.

Milton and the Paradox of the Fortunate Fall (D. Taylor, Jr.), 35-51.

Oneness and Multitude in Coleridge's Poems (M. F. Schulz), 53-60.

Melville and the Civil War (R. H. Fogle), 61-80.

Hopkins's 'Carrian Comfort' (T. J. Assad), 91-102.

T. S. Eliot and John Donne: A Problem in Criticism (E. P. Bollier), 103-18.

Sunrise out of the Waste Land (R. P. Adams), 119-31.

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO QUARTERLY

Vol. xxix, No. 3, April 1960

Joyce Cary's Second Trilogy (E. M. Kerr), 310-25.

Commodity and Honour in *King John* (J. L. Calderwood), 341-56.

Milton's Abstract Music (A. Cook), 379-85.

The Happy Hunting Ground [Joyce's Use of *Hamlet*] (T. Lennam), 386-97.

VICTORIAN STUDIES

Vol. iii, No. 3, March 1960

F. D. Maurice and the Victorian Crisis of Belief (O. Brose), 227-48.

Four Victorian Poets and an Exploding Island (R. D. Altick), 249-60.

Pater and Apuleius (P. Turner), 290-6.

UNIVERSITY OF
GLASGOW

EDWIN MORGAN
J. A. M. RILLIE

LIST OF PUBLICATIONS RECEIVED

[Unless otherwise stated, London is the place and 1959 the date of publication.]

ACTA LITTERARIA ACADEMIAE SCIENTIARUM HUNGARICAE. Tom. II, pp. 478. Budapest, 1959. F. 110.

ADY, C. M. Italian Studies, A Tribute to, ed. E. F. Jacob. pp. 508. 63s.

ALLEN, D. C. (ed.). Four Poets [R. P. Blackmur, Y. Winters, M. Moore, M. Van Doren] on Poetry. pp. vi + 112. Baltimore; London, 24s.

ANNUAL BIBLIOGRAPHY OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE. Vol. xxxi, 1953-1954, ed. L. Sawin, A. Macdonald, and W. White, assd. by J. Thompson. pp. xvi + 534. Cambridge, 7os.

ARNOLD, M. Poems. A Concordance, ed. S. M. Parrish. pp. xxiv + 966. Ithaca, N. Y.; London, 8os.

BALDWIN, T. W. On the Literary Genetics of Shakespeare's Plays 1592-1594. pp. xii + 562. Urbana, 1959. \$8.50.

BEEK, W. J. A. M. John Keble's Literary and Religious Contribution to the Oxford Movement. pp. xvi + 192. Nijmegen.

BLAIR, W. Mark Twain and *Huck Finn*. pp. xviii + 436. Berkeley; London, 6os.

BOND, H. L. The Literary Art of Edward Gibbon. pp. viii + 168. Oxford, 21s.

BROWNING, R. L'Anneau et le Livre, tr. G. Connes, intr. R. Lalou. pp. iv + 710. Paris, 1959. N.F. 20.

BUNYAN, J. Pilgrim's Progress, ed. J. B. Wharey, 2nd edn., revd. R. Sharrock. pp. cxviii + 366. Oxford, 63s.

BURKE, E. Correspondence. Vol. II, July 1768-June 1774, ed. L. S. Sutherland. pp. xxvi + 568. Cambridge; Chicago, 9os.

CALDWELL, E. N. Last Witness for Robert Louis Stevenson. pp. xiv + 384. Norman, Oklahoma, \$5.

CANAVAN, F. The Political Thought of Edmund Burke. pp. xvi + 222. Durham, N.C.; London, 40s.

CARNALL, G. Robert Southey and his Age. pp. xii + 234. Oxford, 30s.

CARSTENSEN, B. Studien zur Syntax des Nomens, Pronomens und der Negation in den *Pastor Letters*. pp. vi + 328. Bochum-Langendreer, 1959.

CHARLESTON, B. M. Studies on the Emotional and Affective Means of Expression in Modern English. pp. 358. Bern. S.Fr. 29.

CLIFFORD, J. L. (ed.). Eighteenth-Century English Literature. pp. xii + 352. New York, 1959; London, 15s.

CURRY, W. C. Chaucer and the Mediaeval Sciences. pp. xxvi + 368. [Revd. edn.] 35s.

DANCHIN, P. Francis Thompson. *La Vie et l'œuvre d'un poète*. pp. 554. Paris, 1959. N.F. 28.

DAVIES, H. A Mirror of the Ministry in Modern Novels. pp. xii + 212. New York, 1959; London, 26s.

DAVIES, H. S. Trollope. pp. 40. 2s. 6d.

DICKINS, B. The Anglo-Saxons. Studies Presented to, ed. P. Clemoes. pp. 322. 35s.

DICKENS, C. Speeches, ed. K. J. Fielding. pp. xxiv + 456. Oxford, 5os.

DONNE, J. Sermons, ed. G. R. Potter and E. M. Simpson. Vol. V, pp. viii + 430; Berkeley, 1959; London, 6os.

DREISER, T. Letters to Louise Campbell, ed. L. Campbell. pp. 124. Philadelphia; London, 1959. 28s.

EARLY ENGLISH TEXT SOCIETY. Facsimile of MS. Bodley 34, introd. N. R. Ker. pp. xviii + 160. 42s.

EKWALL, E. Concise Oxford Dictionary of English Place Names. pp. lii + 546. [4th edn.] Oxford, 5os.

ELLRODT, R. Neoplatonism in the Poetry of Spenser. pp. 248. Geneva. S.Fr. 24.

EMERSON, R. W. Early Lectures. Vol. I, 1833-1836, ed. S. E. Whicher and R. E. Spiller. pp. xxx + 546. Cambridge, Mass., 1959; London, £5.

FEILDELSOHN, C., Jr., and BRODTKORB, P. Jr. (edd.). Interpretations of American Literature. pp. vi + 386. New York, 1959; London, 15s.

FERRY, D. The Limits of Mortality. An Essay on Wordsworth's Major Poems. pp. xii + 182. Middletown, Conn., 1959. \$4.50.

FLANAGAN, T. The Irish Novelists, 1800-1850. pp. xiv + 362. New York, 1959; London, 54s.

GOHDES, C. Bibliographical Guide to the Study of the Literature of the U.S.A. pp. xvi + 102. Durham, N.C.; London, 1959. 30s.

LIST OF PUBLICATIONS RECEIVED

351

GREG, W. W. *Bibliography of the English Printed Drama to the Restoration*. Vol. IV, pp. xii+clxxiv, 1643-1752. 1959. £5. 10s.

HADGRAFT, C. *Australian Literature. A Critical Account to 1955*. pp. viii+302. 25s.

HENINGER, S. K., Jr. *Handbook of Renaissance Meteorology with Particular Reference to Elizabethan and Jacobean Literature*. pp. xii+270. Durham, N.C.; London. 6os.

HILLES, F. W. (ed.). *New Light on Dr. Johnson. Essays on the Occasion of his 250th Birthday*. pp. xii+348. New Haven, 1959; London.

HOLLOWAY, J. *The Chartered Mirror. Literary and Critical Essays*. pp. xii+226. London. 25s.

HONIG, E. *Dark Conceit. The Making of Allegory*. pp. xiv+210. 36s.

HOPKINS, V. C. *Prodigal Puritan. A Life of Delia Bacon*. pp. xviii+362. Cambridge, Mass., 1959; London. 54s.

HOUGH, G. *Reflections on a Literary Revolution*. pp. vi+128. Washington, D.C. \$2.95.

HOVEY, R. B. *John Jay Chapman—an American Mind*. pp. xvi+392. New York, 1959; London. 52s.

HUCKABAY, C. *John Milton: A Bibliographical Supplement 1929-1957*. pp. xii+212. Pittsburgh and Louvain. \$6.25.

HUNT, P. *Samuel Pepys in the Diary*. pp. xii+178. Pittsburgh, 1959; London. 18s.

IRVINE, W. *Thomas Henry Huxley*. pp. 40. 2s. 6d.

JAGGER, J. H. *Handbook of English Grammar*. pp. viii+264. 10s. 6d.

KERNAN, A. *The Cankered Muse. Satire of the English Renaissance*. pp. xii+262. New Haven, 1959; London. 40s.

KER, N. R. *English Manuscripts in the Century After the Norman Conquest*. pp. xiv+68, 29 plates. Oxford. 63s.

KILLHAM, J. (ed.). *Critical Essays on the Poetry of Tennyson*. pp. viii+264. 28s.

KING-HELE, D. *Shelley. His Thought and Work*. pp. viii+390. London. 42s.

KURTH, B. O. *Milton and Christian Heroism*. pp. x+152. Berkeley; London, 1959. 83s.

LAWRENCE, C. H. *St. Edmund of Abingdon*. pp. x+340. Oxford. 6os.

LEACROFT, R. *The Theatre Royal Leicester 1836-1958*. pp. 16. Leicester, 1958.

LERNER, L. *The Truest Poetry*. pp. xii+222. 18s.

LEVIN, D. *History as Romantic Art*. Bancroft, Prescott, Motley, and Parkman. pp. xii+260. Stanford, 1959; London. 44s.

LOFTIS, J. *Comedy and Society from Congreve to Fielding*. pp. xiv+154. Stanford; London. 32s.

MACKERNES, E. D. *The Heeded Voice. Studies in the Literary Status of the Anglican Sermon, 1830-1900*. pp. xvi+158. Cambridge, 1959. 21s.

MADDISON, C. *Apollo and the Nine. A History of the Ode*. pp. x+428. 40s.

MANNING, J. *Dickens on Education*. pp. xii+252. Toronto; London. 44s.

MARSHALL, W. H. *Byron, Shelley, Hunt and The Liberal*. pp. xiv+270. Philadelphia; London. 40s.

MARTIN, H. C. (ed.). *Style in Prose Fiction (English Institute Essays 1958)*. pp. xii+210. New York; London, 1959. 32s.

MIDDLE ENGLISH DICTIONARY, ed. H. Kurath and S. M. Kuhn. Part C. 4. pp. 383-510. Ann Arbor; London. 24s.

MILTON, J. *Complete Prose Works*. Vol. II, 1643-1648, ed. E. Sirruck. pp. xiv+840. New Haven, 1959; London. 45s.

— *Life Records*, ed. J. M. French. Vol. V, 1670-1674, and additions. pp. x+518. New Brunswick, 1958. \$7.50.

MUIR, K. Sir Philip Sidney. pp. 40. 2s. 6d.

MURRY, J. M. *Selected Criticism 1916-1957*, ed. R. Rees. pp. xii+306. 30s.

NÄNNY, M. *John Drydens rhetorische Poetik*. pp. xviii+102. Bern. S.F.R. 12.

NICHOLSON, N. William Cowper. pp. 40. 2s. 6d.

OWL AND THE NIGHTINGALE. THE, ed. E. G. Stanley. pp. vi+210. London and Edinburgh. 15s.

PARKER, M. P. *The Allegory of the Faerie Queene*. pp. viii+326. Oxford. 35s.

PERKINS, D. *The Quest for Permanence. The Symbolism of Wordsworth, Shelley and Keats*. pp. xii+306. Cambridge, Mass.; London, 1959. 44s.

PIERS PLOWMAN. THE A VERSION, ed. G. Kane. pp. xii+458. 70s.

PIKE, E. V. *Words Wanted*. pp. 160. Chicago, 1958. \$2.75.

PIZER, D. *Hamlin Garland's Early Work and Career*. pp. xii+220. Berkeley.

POTTER, G. R. *Macaulay*. pp. 40. 2s. 6d.

PREU, J. A. *The Dean and the Anarchist*. pp. 124. Tallahassee, Florida. 1959.

PRIESTLEY, J. B. *Literature and Western Man*. pp. xiv+512. London. 42s.

LIST OF PUBLICATIONS RECEIVED

REEVES, J. *The Everlasting Circle. English Traditional Verse* ed. from the manuscripts of S. Baring-Gould, H. E. D. Hammond, and George B. Gardiner. pp. xvi+304. 25s.

RITZ, J.-G. Robert Bridges and Gerard Hopkins, 1863-1889. pp. xviii+182. 21s.

SANDHL, B. *Middle English Sea Terms. Vol. II. Masts, Spars, and Sails.* pp. 152. Uppsala, 1958.

SCHACH, P., and HOLLANDER, L. M. *Eyrbyggja Saga.* pp. xii+140. Lincoln, Nebraska, 1959. \$4.25.

SCHUTTE, W. M., and others. *Six Novelists.* pp. x+82. Pittsburgh, 1959. \$1.75.

SCOTTISH TEXT SOCIETY. Douglas, G. Virgil's *Aeneid*, ed. D. F. Caldwell. Vol. III (text), pp. viii+334. Edinburgh.

SHAKESPEARE, W. *King Lear*, ed. G. I. Duthie and J. D. Wilson. pp. lxx+300. *Cymbeline*, ed. J. C. Maxwell. pp. lvi+246. (*The New Shakespeare*.) Cambridge, 18s. each.

SHELLEY, M. W. *Mathilde*, ed. E. Nitchie. pp. xvi+104. Chapel Hill, N.C.; London, 32s.

SKELTON, R. *Cavalier Poets.* pp. 40. 2s. 6d.

SNOW, C. P. *The Affair.* pp. vi+376. 18s.

SOUTHEY, R. *Journals of a Residence in Portugal 1800-1801 and a Visit to France 1838.* ed. A. Cabral. pp. xxiv+286. Oxford. 45s.

SPACKS, P. M. *The Varied God: A Critical Study of Thomson's The Seasons,* pp. xii+194. Berkeley; London, 1959. \$4.00.

SPEIRS, J. *Chaucer the Maker.* pp. 222. [New edn.] 21s.

SPENCER, D. M. *Indian Fiction in English. An Annotated Bibliography.* pp. 98. Philadelphia; London, 36s.

STARKE, E. *From Gautier to Eliot. The influence of France on English Literature 1851-1939.* pp. 236. 21s.

STEINBECK, S. *Der Augesetze M. usch. Zum Leben und Werk von Stella Benson (1862-1923).* pp. vi+156. Bern. S.Fr. 10.

STEINER, G. Tolstoy or Dostoevsky. An Essay in Contrast. pp. vi+356. 1xv. 30s.

STONE, L. C. *English Sports and Recreations.* pp. ii+29+21 plates. Washington, D.C. 75c.

STROUT, A. L. *A Bibliography of Articles in Blackwood's Magazine 1817-1845.* pp. x+202. Lubbock, Texas, 1959. \$3.00.

STUDIES IN BIBLIOGRAPHY. Vol. XIII, ed. F. Bowers. pp. vi+290. Charlottesville, \$6.

TAVE, S. M. *The Amiable Humorist. A Study in the Comic Theory and Criticism of the 18th and 19th centuries.* pp. xii+304. Chicago; London. 40s.

THORP, W. *American Writing in the Twentieth Century.* pp. xiv+354. Cambridge, Mass.; London. 40s.

VAISIER, J. J. (ed.). *A devout treatise called the tree and xii. frutes of the holy goost.* pp. clxxxiii+294. Groningen. 25 guilders.

VIGA-GUUMS SA 1, ed. G. Turville-Petre. pp. lvi+158. [2nd edn.] Oxford. 21s.

WAGENKNECHT, E. (ed.). *Chaucer: Modern Essays in Criticism.* pp. x+414. New York, 1959; London. 15s.

WALLACE, W. M. *Sir Walter Raleigh.* pp. xiv+334. Princeton; London, 1959. 35s.

WEBSTER, J. *The White Devil*, ed. J. R. Brown. pp. lxxiii+206. 21s.

WEDGWOOD, C. V. *Poetry and Politics under the Stuarts.* pp. viii+220. Cambridge. 25s.

WIJK, A. *Regularized English.* pp. 36a. Stockholm, 1959. 33s. 6d.

WILSON, E. C. (ed.). *The Lamentation of Troy for the Death of Hector wherunto is annexed An Olde Womans Tale in his Solitarie Cell by I.O. (1594) now first attributed to Sir John Ogil (1569-1640).* pp. xxii+68. Chicago, 1959.

WINNY, J. (ed.). *Elizabethan Prose Translation.* pp. xxii+152. Cambridge. 15.

WIREKER, N. *The Book of Daun Burnel the Ass, tr. G. R. Regenos.* pp. x+166. Austin. \$4.50.

WRIGHT, C. E. *English Vernacular Hands from the Twelfth to the Fifteenth Centuries.* pp. xx+24+24 plates. Oxford. 35s.

YEAR'S WORK IN ENGLISH STUDIES, ed. R. White and T. S. Dorsch. Vol. XXXVIII, 1957. pp. 274. 30s.

Articles
7-1845.
1959.

III, ed.
Leeds.

orist. A
ry and
centuries.
40s.
in the
. Cam-

treaty
the holy
Bonnigen,
onigen,

e-Petre.
d. 211.

Modern
4. New

igh. pp.
559, 354.
d. J. R.

Politics
o. Cam-
pp. 362.

itation of
hervm
le in his
now first
(1639-1640).

e Trans-
age. 154.
n Burnel
x + 166.

ar Hands
Fifteenth
ates. Ox-

s, ed. R.
XXVIII,